

42
2
SMECTYMNUUS REDIVIVUS.

BEING

An Answer to a Book, entituled,

AN HUMBLE

REMONSTRANCE.

In which,

The Originall of { LITURGY } is discusſed.
 { EPISCOPACY }



And Queres propounded concerning both.

The PARITY of Biſhops and Presbyters in Scripture Demonstrated.

The occasion of their IMPARITY in Antiquity discovered.

The DISPARITY of the Ancient and our Moderne Biſhops manifested.

The ANTIQUITY of ruling Elders in the Church vindicated.

The PRELITICAL Church Bounded.

JEREMY 6.16.

Thus ſaith the Lord, ſtand in the wayes, and behold, and aſke for the Old way, which is the way, and walk therein.

Tertul. de præſcr. adv. hæreſ.

Id Dominicum & verum, quod prius traditum: id autem extraneum & falſum quod ſit poſterius.

LONDON,

Printed by T. C. for John Rothwell, at the Fountaine and Beare in Goldſmiths-row in Cheapſide. 1654.

~~45.04~~

'73-9711



TO THE READER.

Good Reader,

Solomon told us long since, that there is no end of many books, Eccles. 12. 12. Scripturiency (it seemeth) is no novell humour, but abounded then, even when the means of transmitting knowledge was more difficult; if there were cause for the complaint then, there is much more now; since the Presse hath helped the Penne, every one will be scribbling, and so better bookes are neglected, and lie like a few grains of Corn under an heap of Chaffe and dust: usually books are received as fashions; the newest, not the best and most profitable, are most in esteem; in so much that really learned and sober men have been afraid to publish their labours, lest they should divert the world from reading the usefull works of others that wrote before them. *I remember Dr. Altingius a terse and neat spirit, stood out the battery of twenty years importunity, and would not yield to divulge any thing upon this fear. Certainly (Reader) 'tis for thy profit sometimes to look back and consult with them that first laboured in the mines of knowledge, and not alwaies to take up with what

a

commeth

~~95.04~~

'73-9711



TO THE READER.

Good Reader,

Solomon told us long since, that there is no end of many books, Eccles. 12. 12. Scripturiency (it seemeth) is no novell humour, but abounded then, even when the means of transmitting knowledge was more difficult; if there were cause for the complaint then, there is much more now; since the Presse hath helped the Penne, every one will be scribling, and so better bookes are neglected, and lie like a few grains of Corn under an heap of Chaffe and dust: usually books are received as fashions; the newest, not the best and most profitable, are most in esteem; in so much that really learned and sober men have been afraid to publish their labours, lest they should divert the world from reading the usefull works of others that wrote before them. *I remember Dr. Altingius a terse and neat spirit, stood out the battery of twenty years importunity, and would not yield to divulge any thing upon this fear. Certainly (Reader) 'tis for thy profit sometimes to look back and consult with them that first laboured in the mines of knowledge, and not alwaies to take up with what

* Videbat enim passim laborari mole & copia variorum in hoc genere commentationum; novis editionibus anticipem reddi eorum delectu; sed meliores etiam, id est veteres illos et probatos Autores è studiosorum manibus excuti &c. Prefat. Scriptorum Theolog. Henric. Alting.

To the Reader.

*commeth next to hand. In this controversie of Discipline many have written, but not all with a like judgement and strength, which I believe hath been no small rock of offence, and stone of stumbling to the adversaries, who are hardned with nothing so much as a weak defence of the truth, as *Austin complaineth, that when he was a Manichee he had had too too often the victory put into his hands by the defences of weak and unskilfull Christians. This work which the Stationer hath now revived (that it may not be forgotten, and like a Jewel after once shewing shut up in the Cabinet of private studies only) was penned by * severall worthy Divines of great note and fame in the Churches of Christ; under the borrowed and covert name of S M E C T Y M - N U U S, which was some matter of scorn and exception to the adversaries, as the Papists objected to Calvin his printing his Institutions under the name of Alcuinus, and to Bucer his naming himself Aretius Felinus, though all this without ground and reason, the affixion of the name to any work being a thing indifferent; for there we should not consider so much the Author, as the matter, and not who said it, but what; and the assumption of another name not being infamous but where it is done out of deceit, and to anothers prejudice, or out of shame because of guilt, or feare to own the truths which they should*

**Quædam noxia
victoria pænè
mihi semper in
disputationibus
proveniebat cum
Christianis im-
peritis: August.
contra Manich.
cap. 19.*

** Mr. Stephen
Marshall.*

Mr. Edm. Calamy.

Dr. Th. Young.

*Mr. Matthew
Newcomen.*

*Dr. William Spur-
gowe.*

To the Reader.

Should establish: I suppose the reverend Authours were willing to lie hid under this ONOMASTICK, partly that their work might not be received with prejudice, the faction against which they dealt, arrogating to themselves a Monopoly of Learning, and condemning all others as ignorants and novices not worthy to be heard; and partly that they might not burden their Frontispiece with a voluminous nomenclature, it not being usuall to affix so many names at length to one Treatise.

For the work it self, it speaketh its own praise, and is now once more subjected to thy censure and judgement: This second publication of it was occasioned by another book for vindication of the Ministry by the Provinciaall Assembly of London, wherein there are frequent appeals to Smectymnuus; though otherwise I should have judged the reprinting seasonable; for the Lord hath now returned us to such a juncture of time, wherein there is greater freedom of debate without noyse and vulgar prejudice; and certainly if the quarrell of Episcopacy were once cleared, and brought to an issue, we should not be so much in the dark in other parts of Discipline, the conviction of an error by solid grounds being the best way to finde out the truth; reformations carried on with popular tumult, rather then rationally conviction,

To the Reader.

*viſion, ſeldom end well; though the judgement of
God be to be obſerved in pouring contempt upon
thoſe which are partiall in his law, yet the im-
provident leapes which a people are wont to
make upon ſuch occaſions, lay the foundation of a
laſting miſchiefe. I hope that by the review of
theſe matters we ſhall come to know more of the
Lords counſell for the ordering of his houſe, or
at leaſt that by weighing what may be ſaid on all
ſides, we ſhall learn more to * truth it in love,
which is the unfeined deſire of him who is*

ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑ
ἐν ᾧ ὁ πᾶς.
Eph. 4. 15.

Newington,
June 23. 1653.

Thine in the Lord,

THO. MANTON.

Most Honourable Lords,
And ye the Knights, Citizens, and Burgesſes of
the Honourable Houſe of COMMONS.

ALthough we doubt not, but that book which was lately directed to your Honours, bearing the name of an *Humble Remonſtrance*, hath had acceſſe unto your preſence: and is in the firſt approaches of it, diſcovered by your diſcerning ſpirits, to be neither *Humble*, nor a *Remonſtrance*; but a heap of confident and ungrounded aſſertions; ſo that to your Honours a Reply may ſeem ſuperfluous: Yet left the Authour ſhould glory in our ſilence, as a granting of the cauſe; we humbly crave your Honours leave to preſent, not ſo much to your ſelves, as to the world by your hands, a view of this *Remonſtrance*; in which the Authour after too large a *Preface*, undertakes the ſupport of two things, which ſeem to him to be threatned with danger of a preſent precipice, the *Liturgie*, and the *Hierarchy*.

It was a conſtitution of thoſe admired ſons of Juſtice the *Areopagis*; that ſuch as pleaded before them ſhould plead without *preſuming* and without *paſſion*: had your Honours made ſuch a conſtitution, this *Remonſtrance* muſt have been baniſhed from the face of your Aſſembly; for the *Preface* fills almoſt a fourth part of the book, and the reſt ſwells with ſo many *paſſionate Rhetorizations*, as it is harder for us in the multitude of his words to finde what his argument is that we have to anſwer, then to anſwer it when it is found.

We would not trace him in his words, but cloſe immediately with his arguments, did we not finde in him a ſad exemplification of that divine Axiome, *in Multitudine verborum non deſt pec- catum*, in the multitude of words, there wants not ſin: for though the Author is bold to call upon your Honours to heare the words of truth and confidence, yet how little truth there is in his great confidence, the enſuing diſcourſe ſhall diſcover.

His very words are confident enough, and yet as falſe as confident; wherein he *Impropriates all honeſty unto theſe his Papers*, and brands all others with the name of *Libellers*, and yet himſelf finnes deeply againſt the rule of honeſty, and lies naked to the ſcourge of his own cenſure.

Fiſt, in ſetting a brand upon all writings that have lately

issued from the presse, as if they had forgotten to speak any other language then *Libellous*: it seems himselfe had forgotten that some things had issued by authority of the *King* and *Parliament*.

Secondly, in taxing (implicitey) all such as wil not own this Remonstrance for theirs, as none of the peaceable and well-affectèd Sons of the Church of England.

Thirdly, in censuring the way of petitioning your Honours, the ancient and ordinary free way of seeking redresse of our evils, for a *Tumultuary under-hand way*.

Fourthly, in condemning all such as are not fautors of this *Episcopal Cause*, as none of his Majesties good Subjects, engrossing that praise onely to his own party, saying, *The eyes of us the good Subjects of this whole Realme are fixed upon your Successor, &c.*

Fifthly, in *Impropriating* to the same party the praise of *Orthodox*, pag. 6. as if to speak a word, or think a thought against *Episcopacy*, were no lesse *Heresie*, then it was in former time to speak against the Popes supremacy, or the monkes fat belly; whereas whether the *Episcopall* part be the *Orthodox*, peaceable, well-affectèd part, and his Majesties only good Subjects, we leave to your Honours to Judge, upon the numerous informations that flow in unto you from the several parts of this Kingdome.

Nor can they decline your Judgement, seeing now you are (through Gods blessing) happily met in a much longed for *Parliament*: but whither so much longed for by him and his accomplices, as by those against whom he whets his Style, the prayers that have obtained this happy meeting, and the praises that doe attend it, will decide in that great day.

The *Helena*, whose Champion this Remonstrant chiefly is, is that Government which he calls *Sacred*, viz. that Government by *Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Deanes, Archdeacons, &c.* which, saith he, through the fides of some misliked persons some have endeavoured to wound. *Misliked Persons?* and why not offending persons? why not guilty persons? when this *Honourable house* hath found just cause to charge some of them with crimes of the highest nature, Our zeale for your Honours makes us feare, lest your assembly should suffer in this word; as if your proceedings against such persons should be groundèd upon compliance with such as doe mislike them, rather then upon their own demerits or the Justice of this Court.

But whatever those Person s be, the Government it self is *Sacred*; which by the joynt confession of all reformed Divines, derives it self from the times of the blessed Apostles, without any interruption, without

2.

3.

Pag. 2.

4.

Pag. 3.

5.

Pag. 6.

Pag. 2.

Pag. 7.

Untruths.

without contradiction of any one congregation in the world unto this present age. This is but an *Episcopall Bravado*; therefore we let it passe, till we come to close and contend with him in the point; where we shall demonstrate, that in the compasse of three lines he hath packt up as many untruths, as could be smoothly couched in so few words, as any man of common understanding, that lookes upon the face of the Government of almost all reformed Churches in the Christian world may at first view discover.

But before we come to this, there are yet two things in this Preface which we count not unworthy observation. The *First* is, the comparison which he makes between the two Governments, the Civil which with us is *Monarchy*: and the sacred which with him is *Episcopacy*. Of the first he saith, if *Antiquity* may be the Rule (as he pleades it for *Episcopacy*) or if Scripture (as he interprets Scripture) it is *VARIABLE*, and *ARBITRARY*: but the other *DIVINE* and *VNALTERABLE*: so that had men petitioned for the altering of *Monarchicall* Government, they had (in his Judgement) been lesse culpable, both by Scripture and Antiquity, then in petitioning the alteration of the *Hierarchicall*: Had he found but any such passage in any of his *Lowd Libellers* (as his modesty is alwayes pleased to terme them) certainly if we may borrow his own phrase, the eares of the three *Interestèd Kingdomes*, yea all the neighbour Churches, and if we may say, the whole Christian world, and no small part beyond it, had run with the loud cryes of no lesse then *Treason, Treason*.

Truth is, in his *Antiquity* we finde that this his *uninterrupted sacred Government* hath so farre invaded the Civil, and so yoked *Monarchy*, even in this Kingdome, as *Malsbury* reports: That *William Rufus* oppressed by *Bishops*, perswaded the Jewes to convert them; promising thereupon to turne *England* to their Religion, that he might be free of *Bishops*. And this is so natural an effect of *unalterable Episcopacy*, that *Pius* the fourth to the *Spanish* Embassador, importuning him to permit *Bishops* to be declared by the Council of *Trent* to be *Jure Divino*, gave this answer: *Hist. Concil.* That his King knew not what he did desire; for if *Bishops* should be so declared, they would be all exempted from his Power, and as independent as the Pope himself.

The second thing observable is the comparison he makes between the late *Alterations* attempted in our Neighbour Church by his *Episcopal* faction, and that *Alteration* that is now justly desired by the *humble Petitioners* to this *Honourable House*. The one being attempted by strangers, endeavoring violently to obtrude

Remon.
pag. 8.

Malsbury
lib. 4.

Pag. 9.

trude *Innovations* upon a *settled Church and State*, The other *humbly* petitioned to the *Heads and Princes* of our State by *Multitudes* therein almost ruined by an *Innovating Faction*: yet doth not this Remonstrant blush to say; if *these be branded*, (so he calls the just censures of this Honourable House) for *Incendiaries*, how shall *these Bouteux* escape, &c. thus cunningly endeavouring either to justify the former by the practise of the latter, or to render the latter more odious than the former.

The attempts of these men whom he would thus render odious, he craves leave to present to your Honours in two things, which are the subjects of this quarrel: The *Liturgy* and *Episcopacy*; and we *humbly* crave your Honours leave in both to answer.

SECT. II.

Liturgie.

Pag. 10.

First, the *Liturgy* of the *Church of England* (saith he) hath been hitherto esteemed sacred, reverently used by holy Martyrs, daily frequented by devout Protestants, as that which more then once hath been confirmed by the *Edicts* of religious Princes, and your own *Parliamentary Acts*, &c. And hath it so? whence then proceed these many *Additions* and *Alterations*? that have so changed the face and fabrick of the *Liturgy*, that as *Dr. Hall* spake once of the pride of *England*: if our fore-fathers should revive and see their daughters walking in *Cheapside* with their fannes and farthingales, &c. they would wonder what kinde of creatures they were; and say Nature had forgot her self and brought forth a monster: so if these holy Martyrs that once so reverently used the *Liturgy* should revive and look for their *Letany* stamp by Authority of *Parliament*, they would be amazed, and wondering say; *England* had forgotten her self and brought forth, &c. Martyrs? what doe we speak of Martyrs, when we know Sir, that one of your own (a) Bishops said it in the hearing of many not so long since, but you may well remember it, *That the Service of the Church of England was now so drest, that if the Pope should come and see it, he would claime it as his own, but that it is in English?*

It is little then to the advantage of your cause, that you tell us, it is translated into other languages; and as little service have they done to the *Church of England*, who have taught our Prayers to speak *Latine* again: For if it be their Language chiefly that overthrows the *Popes* claime, take away that, and what hinders then, but the *Pope* may say, *these are mine?*

As for other *Translations* and the great applause it hath obtained from *forraigne Divines*, which are the fumes this Remonstrant vendi-

a Ad hoc ma'o-
rum devoluta
est Ecclesia Dei
& sponsa Chri-
sti, ut heretico-
rum exempla
sestentur, &
ad celebranda
Sacramenta
coelestia, discipli-
nam, Lux mu-
tuetur de tene-
bris, & id fa-
ciant christiani
quod Antichristi
faciunt.

Cyp. Ep. 74.

condemns; what late dayes have produced we know not; but the great lights of Former ages have been farre from this applauding: we are sure judicious *Calvin* saith, that in the Liturgy there are sundry *Tolerabiles Ineptiae*, which we think is no very great applause.

To vindicate this Liturgy from scorne (as he calls it) at home or by your Honours aide to reinforce it upon the Nation, is the work of his Remonstrance, for the effecting whereof he falls into an unparalleled discourse about the Antiquity of Liturgies; we call it unparalleled, because no man that we have seen ever drew the line of Liturgy so high as he hath done. P. 13.

Concerning which, if by Liturgy this Remonstrant understand an Order observed in Church assemblies of Praying, reading, and expounding the Scriptures, Administring Sacraments, &c: Such a Liturgy we know and doe acknowledge both Jews and Christians have used. But if by Liturgy he understand prescribed and stinced formes of Administration Composed by some particular men in the Church, and imposed upon all the rest (as this he must understand, or else all he saith is nothing) we desire and expect that those formes, which he saith are yet extant, and ready to be produced, might once appeare.

Liturgy of this former sort we finde in *Justine Martyr* and *Tertullian*. But that there were not such stinced Liturgies as this Remonstrant disputes for, appeares by *Tertullian*, in his *Apol. Cap. 30.* where he saith the Christians of those times did in their public assemblies pray *sine monitore quia de pectore*, without any Prompter but their own hearts. And that so it should be, the same Father proves in his Treatise *de Oratione: Sunt quæ petantur*, &c. There are some things to be asked according to the occasions of every man: the lawfull and ordinary prayer (what is the Lords prayer) being laid as a foundation; It is lawfull to build upon that foundation other prayers according to every ones occasions. And to the same purpose *St. Austin* in his 121. Ep. *liberum est*; &c. it is free to aske the same things that are desired in the Lords Prayer, *aliis atque aliis verbis*, sometimes one way and sometimes another: And before this, in that famous place of *Iust. Mar. Apo. 2.* He, who instructed the people, prayed according to his ability. Nor was this liberty in prayer taken away, and set and imposed formes introduced, untill the time that the *Arian* and *Pelagian* Heresies did invade the Church, and then because those Hereticks did convey and spread their poyson in their formes of Prayer and Hymnes, the Church thought it convenient to restraine the liberty of making and

Just. Mar.
Apost. 2.
Tert. Ap. ad.
Gen. c. 39.

Just. Mar.
Apost. 2.
ὁ πρῶτος ὁρῶν
δύναμις δια-
κρίνει.

1:

and using publicke forms: And first it ordained that none should pray *pro Arbitrio, sed semper eadem preces*, that none should use liberty to vary in prayer, but use alwaies the same forme, *Conc. Laod. Can. 18.* yet this was a forme of his own composing, as appears by another *Canon*, wherein it was ordered thus: None should use any forme, unlesse he had first conferred *Cum fratribus instructoribus*: with the more learned of his brethren. *Conc. Carth. 3. Can. 23.* and lastly that none should use set prayers, but such as were approved of in a Synode, which was not determined till the yeare 416. *Conc. Milev. 2. Can. 12.* And had there been any Liturgies of Times of the first and most venerable antiquity producible, the great admirers of them, and enquirers after them would have presented them to the world ere this.

Concil. Laod.
Can. 18.

Conc. Carth.
3. Can. 23.
Anno 397.

Conc. Milev. 2.
Can. 12. An.
416.

We know that *Bishop Andrewes* in his zeale for Liturgies pursued the enquiry after the *Jewish Liturgy* so far, that he thought he had found it; and one there was which he sent to *Cambridge* to be translated: but there it was soon discovered to have been made long after the *Jewes* ceased to be the Church of God; and so himself suppressed it, that it never saw the light under a translation.

Pag. 10.

We wonder therefore what this Remonstrant meant to affirm so confidently, that *part of the forme of prayer which was composed by our blessed Saviour, was borrowed from the formes of prayer formerly used by Gods people*. An opinion we never met before; indeed, we have read that the *Rabbines* since the dayes of our Saviour have borrowed some expressions from that Prayer, and from other *Evangelical passages*: But we never read till now, that the *Lord Christ* the wisdom of the Father borrowed from the *Wisdom of the Rabines* expressions to use in Prayer.

Pag. 11.

And as much we wonder by what *Revelation or Tradition* (Scripture being silent in the thing) he knew, that *Peter and John*, when they went up to the Temple to pray, their Prayer was not of a sudden and extemporary conception, but of a Regular prescription. Sure we are, some as well read in *Jewish antiquity*, as this Remonstrant shewes himself to be, have told us that the houre of Prayer was the time when the Priest burnt Incense; and the people were at their private prayers without, as appears *Luke 1.9.* where we read, that while *Zachary* the Priest went in to offer Incense, all the people stood without praying in the time of the Oblation. Which Prayers were so far from being *Prescript Formes* or Liturgies that they were not vocal but mental Prayers, as *Master Meade* tells us in his exposition upon the eighth of the Revelations.

And

And whatever Peter and John did, this we know, that when the Publican and the Pharisee went up to the Temple to pray (as *Pag. 18.* the Apostle did at the hour of prayer) their prayer was not of Regular prescription, but of a present Conception.

But if this Remonstrant be in the right, concerning the Jewish Liturgies, then the Evangelical Church might better have improved her peace and happinesse, then in composing Models of Invocation *Pag. 11.* and Thanksgiving, when there is one extant and ready to be produced, that was constantly used by Gods people ever since Moses dayes, and put over to the times of the Gospel, and confirmed by Apostolical practise: or else great is our losse, who are so unhappily deprived of the best improvement, the Church made of her peace and happinesse in the first 300. years: for rejecting those Liturgies that are confessed by the Learned to be *Spurious*: we challenge this Remonstrant to produce any one Liturgie that was the issue of those times. And blessed *Constantine* was herein as unhappy as wee, who needed not have composed forms of prayer for his Guard to use upon the Lords day, but might and would have taken them out of former Liturgies, if there had been any; And can ye with patience think that any ingenuous Christian should be so transported, as upon such weak and unproved premises to build *Pag. 11.* such a *Confident conclusion*, as this Remonstrant doth? and in that Conclusion forget the state of the controversy, sliding from the question of a prescribed and imposed Liturgy to an arbitrary book of prayer.

In his Rhetorical Encomium of conceived prayer we shall more willingly bear a part with him, then they whose cause he pleads; for had that been in their hearts, which is in this book: to hate, to be guilty of pouring water upon the Spirit, and gladly to adde oyle rather: so many learned, able, Conscientious Preachers had not been molested and suspended, for letting the constant flames of their fixed conceptions mount up from the altar of their zealous heart unto the throne of grace: nor had there been so many advantages watched from some stops and seeming solacismes in some mens prayers, to blaspheme the spirit of Prayer, which though now consick to be so far from being offensive, that they are as pleasing Musick in the eares of the Almighty: yet time hath been, when they have sounded as meer Battologies; nay no better then meer Blasphemies in the eares of some Bishops. *Pag. 12.*

And if this conceived prayer be not to be opposed in another, *Pag. 13.* by any man that hath found the true operation of this grace in himself: with that spirit then are those posselt, that have not

onely thus rag'd with their tongues against this way of prayer, but by sealing up the mouths of Ministers for praying thus in publique, and imposing penances upon private Christians for praying thus in their families: and compelling them to *abjure* this practise, have endeavoured with raging violence to banish this divine ordinance from our Churches and dwellings, and protest in open Court, it was fitter for *Amsterdam* then for our Churches.

D. Corbet.
M. Nevel.

But howsoever this applause of conceived prayer may seem to be Cordial, yet he makes it but a *vantage ground* to lift up *publike formes of sacred Church Liturgy* (as he calls it) the higher, that they may have the greater *honour*, that by the *power of your authority* they be reinforced, which work there would have been no need to call your Honours to, had not *Episcopal zeal* broke forth into such flames of indignation against conceived prayers, that we have more just cause to implore the *propitious aide* of the same Authority to re-establish the *Liberty of this*, then they to re-inforce the necessity of that.

Pag. 13.

Yet there are two specious Arguments which this Remonstrant brings to perswade this desired re-inforcement, the Original and Confirmation of our Liturgy.

Pag. 13.

For the first, he tels your Honours, it was selected out of ancient Models not Roman but Christian, contrived by the holy Martyrs and Confessors of the blessed reformation of Religion; where we beseech your Honours to consider how we may trust these men, who sometimes speaking and writing of the Roman Church, proclaime it a true Church of Christ, and yet here Roman and Christian stand in opposition: sometimes they tell men, their Liturgy is wholly taken out of the *Romane Missal*, onely with some little alteration: and here they would perswade your Honours there is nothing *Romane* in it. But it is wholly selected out of pure *Ancient Models*, as the *Quintessence* of them all. Whereas alas the original of it, is published to the world, in that Proclamation of *Edward the first*.

And though here they please to stile the Composers of it, *holy Martyrs and contrivers of the blessed Reformation*: yet there are of the Tribe for whom he pleads, not a few that have called them *Traitors* rather than *Martyrs*, and *Deformers* rather than *Reformers* of our Religion.

24

His other Argument for the Liturgy is taken from that supply of strength it hath received from the recommendation of *four most Religious Princes*, and your own *Parliamentary establishments*: and more especially

especially from the Proclamation of King James of famous memory : the validity of which plea, your Honours are best able to judge, and therefore we leave it at your Bar ; yet these two things we know : first, that this forme was never established to be so punctually observed, so rigorously pressed, to the casting out of all that scruple it, or any thing in it (as many of his Majesties Subjects now doe) to the (almost) justling out of the preaching of the Word and Conceived Prayer altogether.

And secondly, as sure we are, that your Honours think neither your own Lawes, nor the Proclamation of that most famous and ever admired Prince, to be as unalterable as the Lawes of the Medes and Persians.

And now having briefly shewed, that *Liturgies* are not of that antiquity that this Remonstrant pretends, but that *conceived prayer* was in use in the Church of God before *Liturgies*, and is justified from their own mouthes, and not to be found fault with by any but a gracelesse man : and having likewise shewed that our *Liturgy* was taken out of Models, not onely *Christian* but *Romane*, and had since the first compiling of it suffered alteration to the worse, and though established by Law, and confirmed by Proclamation, was never intended to the justling out, either of preaching or conceived prayer ; these things declared, we humbly crave your Honours leave to propound these two *Queries*.

QUERE. I.

Whether it be not fit to consider of the alteration of the present Liturgy.

First, because it symbolizeth so much with the Popish Masse, as that the Pope himself was willing to have it used, if he might but confirme it.

It was made and composed into this frame, on purpose to bring the Papiests to our Churches, which we finde to be with so little successe, as that it hath rather brought many of us to them, then any of them to us, and hath lost many of ours from us.

Because many things therein contained are stumbling blocks before the feet of many : such as these, the clogging it with Ceremonies, and the often and impertinent reiterating of the Lords Prayer, the ill translation of the Psalmes, and other Scriptures, the many phrases in the very prayers, which are liable to just exception. And whereas the Minister by the Scripture is the peoples mouth to God, this book prescribes Responsories to be said by the people, some of which are unsutable to what the Minister pronounceth, some of them seem to favour of Tautology,

gy, some are made to be so essential to the prayer, as that all which the Minister saith, is no prayer without them; as in the *Letany*.

4

Abbot against
Church-for-
sakers.

5

Because it is so much Idolized, as that it is accounted the only worship of God in *England*, and is now made the upholder of a non-preaching Ministry, and is cryed up to that height; as that some are not ashamed to say; that the wit of men and Angels cannot mend it: and that it is a sufficient discharge of the Ministers duty to read this Book.

6

There are such multitudes of people, that distaste this book, that unlesse it be altered, there is no hope of any mutual agreement between Gods Ministers and their people.

There is such a vast difference between it, and the Liturgies of all other reformed Churches, as that it keepees them at a distance from us, and us from full Communion with them.

Q U E R E II.

Whether the first reformers of Religion did ever intend the use of a Liturgy further, then to be an help, in the want, or to the weaknesse of a Minister.

1

All other reformed Churches, though they use Liturgies, yet doe no binde their Ministers to the use of them.

2

A Rubrick in King *Edwards* book left it unto the discretion of the Minister, what and how much to read, when there was a Sermon.

3

The Homilies which are appointed to be read, are left free either to be read or not, by preaching Ministers; and why not then the Liturgy? especially considering that the ability to offer up the peoples wants to God in prayer is part of the Ministerial office, as well as preaching. And if it can be thought, no lesse then sacriledge to rob the people of the Ministers gift in preaching, and to tye them to Homilies, it can be no lesse, to deprive them of their gift in prayer.

4

The ground of the first binding of it upon all to use, was not to tye godly men from exercising their gift in prayer; but the old Popish Priests, that by a seeming returne to our Religion did through indulgence retaine their places, from returning to the old Masse.

5

That which makes many refuse to be present at our Church service, is not onely the Liturgy it self, but the imposing of it upon Ministers. And we finde no way to recover our people to a stunted prayer, but by leaving it free to use or not to use.

Ob.

If it be objected, that this will breed divisions and disturban-

ces in Churches, unlesse there be a uniformity, and that there are many unable.

It hath not bred any disturbance in other reformed Churches. *Ans.*

Why should the free liberty of using or not using a Liturgy, breed more confusion then the free liberty of reading or not reading Homilies? especially when Ministers shall teach people, not to condemne one another in things indifferent.

If there be a care taken in those that have the power to make Ministers, to choose men gifted as well for prayer as preaching, there cannot be conceived how any inconvenience should follow. Or if afterwards it should appeare, that any Minister should prove insufficient to discharge the duty of prayer in a conceived way, it may be imposed on him as a punishment, to use set forms and no other. But why any Minister that hath the gift of prayer, in an abundant measure, as well as of preaching, should be hindered from exercising his gift well, because another useeth it ill, is a new Divinity never heard of in Gods Church, till Bishop *Wrens* dayes, who forbad all use of conceived prayer in the Church.

SECT. III.

WE come now with your *Honours* favour, to the second point disputed in this Remonstrance; *Episcopacy it selfe*, against which, whatsoever hath been either spoken or written by any, either *learned Divines*, or *well-reformed Churches* (as his conscience knows, there are of both that have writ against it) is Taxed by him as no other then the *unjust Clamors either of weak or factious persons*. Sure the man thinkes he hath obtained a *Monopoly* of learning, and all *Knowledge* is lockt up in his bosome; and not onely *Knowledge* but *piety* and *peaceablenesse* too; for all that are not of his opinion, must suffer either as weak or factious, if he may be their Judge. We know not what this *Arrogancy* might attempt to fasten upon your *Honours*, should the bowels of your compassion be enlarged, to weigh in the Ballance of your wisdomes, the multitude of *Humble petitions*, presented to you from several parts of this Kingdome, that hath long groaned under the Iron and Insupportable yoke of this *Episcopal Government*, which yet we doubt not, but your *Honours* will please to take into your prudent and pious consideration: Especially knowing it is their continual practise to loade with the odious names of *Faction* all that justly complaine of their *unjust oppression*.

In

Pag. 17.

In his addresse to his defence of Episcopacy, he makes an unhappy confession that he is confounded in himselfe. Your Honours may in this believe him; for he that reads this remonstrance, may easily observe so many falsities and contradictions, (though presented to publike view, with a face of confident boldnesse,) as could not fall from the Pen of any, but *self-confounded man*: which though we doubt not but your Honours have deserved; yet because they are hid from an errant and unobserving eye, under the Embroideries of a silken Language, we Humbly crave your Honours leave to put them one by one upon the file, that the world may see what credit is to be given to the bold assertions of this confident Remonstrant.

* Pag. 2.

One of these Sonnes of the Church of England whose messenger this Remonstrant is, was he who swore by the Eternal God, he would be the death of those that did appeare to move against the grievances of Episcopacy; and if the rest of these Millions mentioned pag. 2. whose thousands are so punctually calculated p. 41. be of this spirit, they are an army of very peaceable & right-affected men.

2

Pag. 7.

Evarestus.
100.

Dionysius.
260.

Some say
267. as Pel.
Virg.

Pag. 13, 14.

First, in his second page, he dubs his book **the faithful messenger of all (a) the peaceable and right affected soues of the Church of England*: which words (besides that unchristian *Thera*, which as we already observed, they set upon all that are not of his party,) carry in the bowels of them a notorious falsity and contradiction to the phrase of the book; for how could this book be the messenger of all *his own party* in England, when it is not to be imagined, that all could know of the coming forth of this book before it was published? and how can that book crave admittance in *all their names*, that speaks in the singular number, and as in the person of one man almost the whole book thorow.

But it may be some will say, this is but a small slip; well be it so: but in the seventh page he layes it on in four lines, asserting these four things: First, that *Episcopall Government*, (that very same Episcopal Government, which some he saith seekes to wound, that is Government by Diocesan Bishops) derives it self from the Apostles times; which though we shall *ov. deo* more fully confute anon, yet we cannot here but rank it among his notorious---: for how could there be such Government of a Diocese by a Bishop derived from the Apostles times, when in the Apostles times there were no Bishops distinct from Presbyters, as we shall shew? and if there had been Bishops, yet they were no Diocesans; for it was a hundred yeares after Christ, or as most agree 260. before Parishes were distinguished, and there must be a distinction of Parishes before there could be an union of them into Dioceses.

Secondly, it is by the *joynt confession of all reformed Divines granted*, that this sacred Government is derived from the Apostles: What all reformed Divines? was Calvin, Beza, Junius, &c. of that minde? Are the reformed Churches of France, Scotland, Netherlands, of that Judgement? we shall shew anon that there is no

more

more truth in this Assertion then if he had said with *Anaxagoras*, snow is black, or with *Copernicus*, the Earth moves, and the Heavens stand still.

Thirdly, he saith this Government hath continued without any interruption: What doth he meane, at Rome? for we reade in some places of the world this Government was never known for many yeares together: as in *Scotland*, we read that in Ancient times the *Scots* were instructed in the Christian faith by Priests and Monkes, and were without Bishops 290. yeares: yea to come to *England*, we would desire to know of this Remonstrant whether God had a Church in *England* in *Q. Maries* dayes or no? and if so, who were then the Bishops of this Church, for some there must be, if it be true that this man saith, this Government hath continued without any interruption unto this day, and Bishops then we know not where to finde but in the line of Popish succession.

John Maior
l.2. Hist. de
gest. Scot.
Cap. 2.

Fourthly, he saith it hath thus continued without the contradiction of any one Congregation in the Christian world. It seemes he hath forgotten, what their own darling *Heylin* hath written of the people of *Biscay* in *Spaine*, that they admit of no Bishops to come among them; for when *Ferdinand* the Catholike came in progresse accompanied among others with the Bishop of *Pamplone*, the people rose up in Armes, drove back the Bishop, and gathering up all the dust which they thought he had trode on, flung it into the Sea.

Heylins
Geog. p. 55.

Which story had it been recorded onely by him, would have been of lighter Credit. But we reade the same in the Spanish Chronicle, who saith more then the Doctor: for he tels us that the People threw that dust that the Bishop or his Mule had trode on, into the Sea with *Curses and Imprecations*: which certainly saith he was not done without some *Mystery*, those people not being voide of Religion, but superstitiously devout as the rest of the Spaniards are: so that there is one Congregation in the Christian world in which this Government hath met with contradiction.

Gener. Hist.
of Spain l. 22

And are not the *French*, *Scottish*, and *Belgick* Churches worthy to be counted Christian Congregations? and who knowes not that amongst these this Government hath met not onely with verbal but reall contradiction?

Yet he cannot leave his---: But within two pages is at it againe; and tels us of an unquestionable clearenesse wherein it hath been from the Apostles derived to us: how unquestionable? when the

6
Pag. 9.

the many volumes written about it, witnesse to the world, and to his conscience, it hath been as much questioned as any point (almost) in our Religion.

7 And that assertion of his that tels us that the people of God had a forme of prayer, as ancient as Moses, which was constantly practised to the Apostles dayes, and by the Apostles; &c. though we have shewed how bold and false this assertion is, yet we mention it here as deserving to be put into the Catalogue.

8
Pag. 18. And that he may not seem *Contra mentem ire*, but to be of the same minde still, p. 18. he saith, *Episcopal Government hath continued in this Island ever since the first plantation of the Gospel without contradiction.* Had he taken a lesse space of time, and said but since the resuscitation of the Gospel: we can prove it to him and shall, that since the reformation, Episcopacy hath been more contradicted, then ever the Papacy was before the extirpation of it.

9 Yet still the man runs on, thinking to get credit to his untruths by their multiplications; for pag. 21. he saith; *Certainly, except all Histories, all Authors saile us, nothing can be more certaine then this truth: Os Durum!* Nothing more certaine! what is it not more certain that there is a God? is it not more certain that Christ is God and man? is it not more certain that Christ is the only Saviour of the world? Nothing more certain! must this then be an Article of our Creed, the corner stone of our Religion? must this be of necessity to Salvation? Nothing more certain! O that men should not onely forget themselves, but God also: and in their zeale for their own Honour utter words bordering upon *Blasphemy*.

Pag. 18. Indignation will not suffer us to prosecute these falsities of his any further; we will leave this displeasing service, onely retorting the words of this Remonstrant upon himself, *Surely could he look with our eyes* (or any eyes that were not partial) *he would see cause to be thoughtly ashamed of these his grosse injurious miscarriages, and should be forced to confesse, that never good cause* (if cause be good) *had more reason to complaine of a sinful prosecution.*

SECT. IV.

WE will now come with your Honours patience, to weigh whether there be any more strength in his arguments, then there is truth in his assertions.

His Plea for Episcopacy consists of two parts. In the first he brings

brings arguments for the supporting of it. In the second he undertakes to answer the objections that may be made against it.

His first argument for it, is couched in these words; *Were this Ordinance meerly Humane or Ecclesiastical, if there could no more be said for it, but that it is exceeding Ancient, of more then 15. hundred years, &c.* The strength of which argument lies in this, that they have been in peaceable possession of this government fifteen hundred years and upwards; and in this Island ever since the Gospel, without contradiction.

In which words he speaks two things which deserve just censure. First, that the Hierarchical Government hath continued for fifteen hundred years; therefore should not now be altered; which may well be called, as *Hierom* in another Case, *Argumentum Galeatum*, an Argument calculated for the Meridian of Episcopacy, and may indifferently serve for all Religions in the World: For thus the Jews might have pleaded against Christ the Antiquity of more then so many hundred years; and thus the Heathens did plead against the Christian Religion, which *Justin Martyr* in his Apology answers. And by this Argument the Pope sits as fast rivetted in his chayre at Rome, as ours in theirs: whose Plea for Antiquity runs parallel with theirs. It is a good observation of *Cyprian*, that Christ said, *Ego sum via, veritas & vita*; not *Ego sum consuetudo*; and * that *Consuetudo sine veritate est vestustas erroris*, Christ is Truth, and not Custome; and Custome without Truth, is a mouldy error: and as *Sir Francis Bacon* * *Frustra consuetudinem non his opponunt, quasi consuetudo major sit veritate, aut non id sit in spiritualibus sequendum, quod in melius fuerit à Spiritu Sancto Revelatum: Cyp. Ep. 73.* *Antiquity without Truth, is a Cypher without a Figure.*

Yet had this *b* Remonstrant been as well versed in Antiquity, as he would bear the world in hand he hath, he might have found Learned Ancients affirming, there was a Time when the Church was not governed by Bishops, but by Presbyters. And when by Bishops, he might further have seen more affinity between our Bishops and the Pope of Rome, then between the Primitive Bishops and them. And that as *King James* of famous memory, said of the Religion of England, that it differed no more from Rome, then Rome did from what it was at first; may as truly be said of Bishops, that we differ no more from them then they do from what Bishops were, when first they were raised.

Apostolicà, that is, the Bishop that is the same with a Presbyter, is of fifteen hundred years standing; but a Bishop *Phrasi Pontificià*, that is, a distinct order superiour to a Presbyter, invested with sole power of Ordination and Jurisdiction, is but a Novell Invention.

sed unto this eminency : which difference we shall shew in our ensuing Discourse, to be so great, that as he said of Rome, he did *Romam in Roma querere*, he sought Rome in Rome; so wee *Episcopatum in Episcopatu*, may go seek for a Bishop among all our Bishops.

And whereas in his application of this Argument to the Bishops of this Nation, he saith, *It hath continued in this Island ever since the first plantation of the Gospel, without contradiction*; which is his *Second* in this Argument : How false this is, we have declared already; and we all know, and himselfe cannot but know, that there is no one thing since the reformation, that hath met with so much *Contradiction* as *Episcopacy* hath done; witnesse the severall Books written in the Reigns of our severall Princes, and the many *Petitions* exhibited to our severall *Parliaments*, and the many speeches made therein againg *Episcopal Government* : many of which are yet extant.

Pag. 19.

Pag. 19.

* What the establishment of Episcopacy by the Lawes is, and upon what ground- ed, the learned Sir Edward Cook informes us, who reports, That in an Act of Parliament holden at Carlisle in the 26. year of Edw. 1. it is declared that the holy

Church of England was founded in the state of Prelacy within the Realm of England, by the King and his Predecessors, &c. for them to inform the people in the Law of God, and to keep hospitality, and give almes, and do other works of charity. And the said Kings in times past were wont to have their advice and counsell for the safe-guard of the Realme, when they had need of such Prelates and Clerks so advanced. *Cook de jure Regis Ecclesiastico*. But whether Bishops have observed the Orders of their first foundation, &c.

As for that supply of Accessory strength, which he begs to this Argument, from the *light of nature, and the rules of just policy*, which (saith he) *teacheth us not easily to give way to the change of those things which long use and many * Laws have firmly established, as Necessary and Beneficial*; it is evident, that those things which to former Ages have seemed *Necessary and Beneficial*, may to succeeding Generations, prove not *Necessary* but *Noxious*, not *Beneficial*, but *Burthensome*; And then the same *light of nature*, and the same *just policy*, that did at the first command the establishment of them, may and will perswade their *Abolishment*; if not, either our Parliaments must never Repeale any of their former Acts (which yet they have justly and wisely done) or else in so doing must run Counter to the *light of nature*, and the *Rules of just policy*; which to think were an impiety to be punished by the Judge.

SECT. V.

Pag. 19. 20.

THe Second Argument for the defence of Episcopal Government, is from the *Pedigree of this holy Calling*, which he derives from no less then an *Apostolical*, and in that right divine institution

ration; and assayes to prove it from the practice of the Apostles and as he saith, the *clear practice of their Successors, continued in Christs Church to this very day*: And to this Argument he so much confides, that he concludes it with this *Triumphant Epiphonema, What scruple can remain in any ingenuous heart? And determines, if any continue yet unsatisfied, it is in despite of reason, and all evidence of History, and because he wilfully shuts his eyes with a purpose not to see the light. Bona verba.* Pag. 21.

By your favour Sir, we will tell you notwithstanding the supposed strength of your argumentation, there is one scruple yet remaining; and if you would know upon what ground, it is this; because we find in Scripture (which by your own confession is *Original Authority*) that Bishops and Presbyters were *Originally* the same, though afterwards they came to be distinguished: and in process of time, Episcopacy did swallow up all the honor and power of the Presbytery, as *Pharaoh's lean Kine* did the fat. Pag. 2.

Their Identity is discernable: first, from the same names given unto both: secondly, from the same office designed unto both in Scripture. As for the names, are not the same names given unto both in Sacred Writ? Let the fifth, sixth, and seventh verses of the first Chapter to *Titus* testifie: in the fifth verse, the Apostle shews that he left *Titus* in Crete to ordain Elders in every City; in the sixth verse, he gives a delineation of the persons that are capable of such Ordination: and in the seventh, the Reason, why the person to be ordained, must be so qualified: *for a Bishop, &c.* Now if the Bishop and Elder be not here the same, but names of distinct office and order, the Apostles reason rendred in the seventh verse of his direction in the fifth and sixth verses, is (with reverence be it spoken) inconsequential, and his demand unjust. If a Chancellor in one of the Universities should give order to his Vice-Chancellor to admit none to the degree of Batchelour in Arts, but such as were able to preach, or keep a Divinity Aft: *For Batchelours in Divinity must be so*: what reason or equity were in this? So if *Paul* leaving *Titus* as his *Locum tenens*, as it were in Crete for a season, should give order to him not to admit any to be an Elder but one thus and thus qualified, because a Bishop must be so: had a Bishop been an Order or Calling distinct from, or superior to a Presbyter, and not the same, this had been no more rational or equal than the former: therefore under the name of Bishop in the seventh verse the Apostle intends the Elder mentioned in the fifth verse. Consonant to this is the Language of the same Apostle, *Acts. 20. v. 17. 18.* where such as in 17. verse he calls *πρεσβυτερος, Elders*, in the 18. he calls *ἐπισκοπος*, in ordinary English, *Bishops*, though our Trans-

lation there, (we know not for what reason) reads it *Overseers*: not so rendring the word in any other Text.

And though this Remonstrant undertakes to shew a clear and received distinction of Bishops, Presbyters, & Deacons, as three distinct subordinate Callings in Gods Church, with an evident specification of the duty & charge belonging to each of them, or else let this claimed Hierarchy be for ever booted out of the Church: Yet let us tell him, that we never find in Scripture these three Orders, *Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons*, mentioned together: but onely *Bishops* and *Deacons*, as *Phil. 1.* and *1. Tim.* Nor do we find in Scripture any Ordination to the office of a Bishop, differing from the Ordination of an Elder: Nor do we find in Scripture, the specification of any Duty charged upon a Bishop, that Elders are secluded from: Nor any qualification required in a Bishop, that is not requisite in every *Presbyter*; some of which, if not all, would be found, were they not the same.

But if this Remonstrant think to help himselfe by taking Sanctuary in *Antiquity* (though we would gladly rest in Scripture, the Sanctuary of the Lord) yet we will follow him thither, and there shew him that *Hierome* from the Scriptures proves more then once, *Presbyters* and *Bishops* to be the same. And *Chrysostome* in *Philip. 1. Homil. 2.* with his admirer *Theophilact* in *Philip. 1.* affirms that while the Apostles lived, the names of *Bishops* and *Presbyters* were not distinguished: and not onely while the Apostles lived, but in after ages. Doth not *Ireneus* use the name of *Bishops* and *Presbyters* *ἀδελφοί*, in a promiscuous sense? Are not *Anicetus, Pius, Hyginus, Telephorus, Sixtus*, whom the Papists call Bishops, and the Popes predecessors, termed by *Eusebius* Presbyters? Nor was it strange in the Primitive times to hear Bishops called Presbyters, when Presbyters writing to their Bishop have called him *Frater*. So *Cyprian* (*Epist. 26.* in the beginning) is styled by his Presbyters, Deacons and Confessors; nor was that holy Martyr offended with that title, nor they condemned of insolency that used it.

But what should we burthen your patience with more testimonies, when the evidence of this truth hath shined with so strong a beam that even our *Adversaries* have stooped to it, and confessed that their Names were the same in the Apostles time? But yet say they, the Offices were distinct.

Now here we would gladly know, what these men make the distinct Office of a Bishop.

Is it to edifie the Church by Word and Sacrament? is it to ordain others to that work? is it to rule, to govern, by admonition and other censures? if any of these, if all these make up the pro-

*Hierony. Ep. ad
Evag. & ad
Ovea.*

*Iren. adver.
her. l. 4. cap.
43. 44.*

*Hist. Lib. 5.
Cap. 23.*

*Bellarmin. de
Cleric. Lib.
1. cap. 15.*

per worke of a Bishop; we can prove from Scripture that all these ^{a Presbyteria} belong unto the Presbytery, which is no more then was granted ^{sicut Episcopis} by a Council. ^{Dispensatio}
^{Mysteriorum}

Dei commissa est: Præsunt enim Ecclesia Christi: in Consecratione Dominici corporis & sanguinis, conser-
tes sunt cum Episcopis: & similiter in Doctrina Populorum & in officio predicandi: ac solum propter au-
toritatem, summo Sacerdoti Clericorum Ordinario reservata est: Concil. Aquisgran. primum, Can. 8.

Evangelium tribuit his qui præsunt Ecclesia Mandatum docendi Evangelii, remittendi peccata, admi-
nistrandi Sacramenta: præterea jurisdictionem; videlicet Mandatum Excommunicandi eos quorum nota
sunt crimina, & Resipiscentes rursus absolvendi: Ac Omnium Confessione, etiam adversariorum liquet,
hanc potestatem Jure Divino communem esse Omnibus qui præsunt Ecclesia, sive Pastores vocentur, sive
Presbyteri, sive Episcopi. Scriptum Philip. Melanch. in conventu Smalcald. Anno. 1540. a præcipuis
illarum Ecclesiarum Doctoribus communi Consensu comprobatur de potestate & jurisdictione Episcoporum.

For the first, Edifying of the Church by word and Sacraments, though we feare they will some of them at least scarce own this as *their proper worke* (for some have been cited into the *High Commission* for saying, it belongs to them) yet Sir we are sure, Scripture makes it a part, a chiefe of the Episcopal office; for so in the 1 Pet. ^{ἐπισκοπῆν.} 3. 2. they are said to doe the work of a Bishop, when they do feed ^{ποιμαίνον.} the flock of God. And this is such a work as we hope their Lordships will give the poor Presbyters leave to share with them in: or if not, we will tell them that the Apostle Peter in that forecited place, and the Apostle Paul, *Acts. 20.* binds this work upon our hands, and *Woe unto us if we preach not the Gospel.*

But this branch of Episcopal and Presbyterial office we passe with brevity, because in this there lies not so much controversie as in the next, which they doe more wholly *Impropriate* to themselves: the power of Ordination.

Which power, that it was in former times in the hands of Presbyters, appears 1 Tim. 4. 14. *Neglect not the gift which was given thee by Prophecie, and by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.* The gift here spoken of is the Ministerial gift, the exercise whereof, the Apostle exhorts Timothy not to neglect, which saith he, he had received, not by the laying on of the hands of one single man, whether Apostle, or Bishop, or Presbyter, but *τῷ πρεσβυτηρίῳ* the Presbytery, that is, the whole company of Presbyters, for in that sense onely we finde *τῷ πρεσβυτηρίῳ* taken in Scripture, as in Luke 22. vers. 66. *Acts. 22.* vers. 5. which the Christian Church called the Ecclesiastical Senate as Ierom in Isay 3. *Nos habemus in Ecclesia Senatum nostrum, Cæterum Presbyterorum, & an Apostolical Senate: οὐδὲν ἄλλω Ignatius Epis. ad Magnes. and some times πρεσβυτηρίῳ Concil. Ancyr. Can. 18.* Jerom. Isay. 3.

And though the Apostle in his second Epistle to Tim. 1. 6. makes Ign. Epis. mention of the laying on of his hands: yet to maintaine the Harmony of Scripture, it must not be denied but there was imposition of hands by the Presbytery as well as by himself, and so it was a joynt act; So that in this there is no more difference then in the former.
Aud

And if there be no difference between Presbyters in feeding or ordaining, let us see if there be any in the third part of their office of *Ruling*, which though our *Bishops* asseme wholly to themselves, yet we shall discover, that it hath been committed to and exercised by *Presbyteriall* hands.

For who are they of whom the Scripture speakes, *Heb. 13. 17. Obey them that have the Rule over you? for they watch for your soules, as they that must give an account, &c.*

Here all such as watch over the souls of Gods people, are intitled to rule over them. So that unlesse *Bishops* will say, that they onely watch over the souls of Gods people, and are only to give an account for them, they cannot challenge to themselves the sole rule over them. And if the *Bishops* can give us good security, that they will acquit us from giving up our account to God for the souls of his people, we will quit our plea, and resigne to them the sole rule over them.

So againe in the *1 Thessa. 5. 12. Know them which labour amongst you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you.*

In which words are contained these truthe; First that in one Church (for the *Thessalonians* were but one Church, *1. Ca.*) there was not *ὁ πρῶτος κειμένος* but *οἱ πρῶτοι κειμένοι*; not one chiefe Bishop or President, but the Presidency was in many.

Secondly, that this Presidency was of such as laboured in the word and Doctrine.

Thirdly, that the Censures of the Church were managed not by one, but by them all in *Communi. Them that admonish you.*

Fourthly, that there was among them a Parity: for the Apostle bids know them in an indifferency, not discriminating one from another: yea such was the rule that Elders had, that *S. Peter* thought it needful to make an exhortation to them to use their power with Moderation, not Lording it over Gods Heritage, *1 Pet. 5. 3.*

By this time we have sufficiently proved from Scripture, that *Bishops* and *Presbyters* are the same in name, in Office, in Edifying the Church, in power of Ordination and Jurisdiction: we sum up all that hath been spoken in one argument:

They which have the same Name, the same Ordination to their Office, the same qualification for their Office, the same worke to feed the flock of God, to ordaine pastors and Elders, to Rule and Govern; they are one and the same Office: but such are *Bishops* and *Presbyters*; Ergo.

SECT. VI.

BUT the dint of all this Scripture, the Remonstrant would elude, by obtruding upon his reader a commentary (as he calls it) of

the Apostles own practise (which he would force to contradict their own rules) to which he superadds the unquestionable glosse of the cleave practise of their immediate successors in this administration. For the Apostles practise, we have already discovered it, from the Apostles own writings; and for his Glosse he superadds, if it corrupts not the Text, we shall admit it; but if it doe, we must answer with *Tertullian*; *Id verum quodcumq; primum: id adulterum quod posterius*, whatsoever is first is true; but that which is latter is adulterous.

In the examination of this Glosse, to avoyd needlesse Controversie, First, we take for granted by both sides, that the first and best Antiquity, used the names of Bishops and Presbyters promiscuously. Secondly, that in proceesse of time, some one was honoured with the name of Bishop, and the rest were called Presbyters or Cleri. Thirdly, that this was not *Nomen inane*, but there was some kinde of Imparity between him and the rest of the Presbyters.

Yet in this we differ; that they say, this Impropriation of name, and Imparity of place, is of Divine Right and Apostolical Institution: we affirme both to be occasional, and of humane Invention; and undertake to shew out of Antiquity, both the occasion upon which, and the Persons by whom this Imparity was brought into the Church.

On our parts stands *Jerome* and *Ambrose*, and others, whom we doubt not but our Remonstrant will grant a place among his Glossators: Saint *Jerome* tells us in *1 Tit.*

Idem est ergo Presbyter qui A Presbyter and a Bishop is the
Episcopus: & antequam Diabolus same: and before there were through
li instigant, studia in Religione the Devils instigant, divisions in Reli-
ficerent, & diceretur in populis, gion, and the people began to say, I
ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego am of Paul, and I of Apollo, and I of
Cephæ, Communi Presbyterorum Cephæ, the Churches were governed
Consilio ecclesie gubernabantur. by the Common-councell of the
Postquam vero unusquisque Presbyters. But after that each man
eos quos baptizaverat suos pu- began to account those whom he had
tabat esse, non Christi; in toto baptized his own, and not Christs; it
Orbe decretum est, ut unus de was decreed thorow the whole world,
Presbyteris electus superpone- that one of the Presbyters should be
retur ceteris, ad quem om- set over the rest; to whom the care
nis Ecclesie Cura pertineret, & of all the Church should belong, that
schismaticum semina tollerentur. the seeds of schisme might be taken
Putat aliquis non Scriptura- away. Thinks any, that this is my
rum, sed nostram esse senti- opinion, and not the opinion of the
am, Episcopum & Presbyterum Scripture, that a Bishop and an Elder
unum esse, & aliud etatis, aliud is the same? let him read the words
of

esse nomen officii, relegat Apo- of the Apostle to the *Philippians*, say-
stoli ad Philippenses verba, di- ing, *Paul and Timothy*, the servants of
centis, Paulus & Timotheus *Iesus Christ*, to them that are at *Phi-*
servi Iesu Christi qui sunt Phi- lippi, with the Bishops and Deacons.
lippiis, cum Episcopis & Dia- *Philippi* is one city of *Macedonia*, and
conis, &c. *Philippi una est urbs* certainly in one city there could not
Macedoniæ, & certè in una Ci- be many Bishops (as they are now called
uitate non poterant plures esse &c.) and after the allegations of many
(ut nuncupantur) Episcopi, &c. other Scriptures, he concludes thus; as
sicut ergo Presbyteri sciant se the Elders therefore may know, that
ex Ecclesiæ consuetudine ei qui they are to be subject to him that is
sibi prepositus. fuerit esse subje- set over them by the custome of the
ctos; Ita Episcopi noverint se Church; so let the Bishops know, that
magis consuetudine, quam dif- it is more from custome, then from
positionis Dominicæ veritate any true dispensation from the Lord,
Presbyteris esse majores, & in that they are above the Presbyters,
Communi debere Ecclesiam re- & that they ought to rule the Church
gere. in common.

In which words of *Ierome*, these five things present themselves to the Readers view;

First, that *Bishops* and *Presbyters* are originally the same; *Idem ergo est Presbyter qui Episcopus.*

Secondly, that that Imparity that was in his time between Bishops and Elders, was grounded upon Ecclesiastical custome, and not upon devine Institution; *Episcopi noverint, &c.*

Thirdly, that this was not his private judgement, but the judgement of Scripture; *Putat aliquis, &c.*

Fourthly, that before this Priority was upon this occasion started, the Church was governed *Communi Presbyterorum Consilio*, by the Counfel of the Presbyters in common, and that even after this imparity, it ought to be so governed; *Sciant Episcopi se Ecclesiam debere in communi regere.*

Fifthly, that the occasion of this Imparity and Superiority of Bishops above Elders, was the divisions which through the Devils instin& fell among the Churches; *Postquam verò Diaboli instin&u.*

Saravia would take advantage of this place, to deduce this Imparity as high as from the Apostles times, because even then they began to say, *I am of Paul, and I of Apollos*: but sure *S. Ierome* was not so weake as this man would make him, to speak Inconsistencies; and when he propounds it to himself, to prove that *Bishops* and *Presbyters* are in Scripture the same, to let fall words that should confute his own proposition: whereas therefore *S. Ierome* saith, that
 after

after men began to say, *I am of Paul, and I of Apolos*, &c. it was decreed that one of the Presbyters should be set over the rest, &c. This is spoken indeed in the Apostles phrase, but not of the Apostles times, else to what purpose, is that coacervation of texts that followes?

But suppose it should be granted to be of Apostolical antiquity (which yet we grant not, having proved the contrary) yet it appears, it was not of *Apostolical intention*, but of *Diabolical occasion*: And though the Devil by kindling Divisions in the Church, did minister *Occasion* to the invention of the primacy or prelacy or one for the suppressing of Schisme; yet there is just cause to think, that the Spirit of God in his Apostles was never the author of this invention.

First, because we read in the Apostles dayes there were Divisions, *Rom. 16.7.* and Schismes, *1 Cor. 3.3.* and *11. 18.* yet the Apostle was not directed by the holy Ghost to ordaine Bishops for the taking away of those Divisions. Neither in the rules he prescribes for the healing of those breaches, doth he mention *Bishops* for that end: Nor in the Directions given to *Timothy* and *Titus* for the *Ordination of Bishops or Elders*; doth he mention this as one end of their *Ordination*, or one peculiar duty of their office. And though the Apostle saith, *Oportet hereses inter vos esse, ut quæ probati sunt manifesti fiant inter vos*; yet the Apostle no where saith, *Oportet Episcopos esse, ut tollantur hereses, quæ manifestæ fiunt.*

Secondly, because as Doctor *Whitaker* saith, the remedy devised hath proved worse then the disease, which doth never happen to that remedy whereof the holy Ghost is the author.

Thirdly, because the holy Ghost, who could foresee what would ensue thereupon, would never ordaine that for a remedy, which would not onely be ineffectual to the cutting off of evil, but become a stirrup for Antichrist to get into his saddle. For if there be a necessity of setting up one *Bishop* over many *Presbyters* for preventing schismes, there is as great a necessity of setting up one *Archbishop* over many *Bishops*, and one *Patriarch* over many *Archbishops*, and one *Pope* over all, unlesse men will imagine, that there is a danger of schisme onely among *Presbyters*, and not among *Bishops* and *Archbishops*, which is contrary to *reason, truth, History*, and our own *Experience*.

And lest our adversaries should appeale from *Hierome* as an incompetent Judge in this case, because a *Presbyter*, and so a party, we will therefore subjoyne the jndgments of other ancient Fathers who were themselves *Bishops*.

The Commentaries that go under the name of Saint *Ambrose* upon *Ephes. 4.* mention another occasion of this Discrimination

* *At ubi omnia
Loca Circum-
plexa est Eccle-
sia, Conventi-
cula constituta
sunt: & cape-
runt Rectores:
& Caetera Offi-
cia in Ecclesiis
sunt ordinata.
Capit aliot or-
dine & Provi-
dentia guber-
nari Ecclesia.
Ideo non per
omnia conveniunt Scripta Apostolice ordinationi quae nunc in Ecclesia est, quia haec inter ipsa primordia
scripta sunt. Nam & Timotheum à se Presbyterium Creatum Episcopum vocat, &c. Sed quia ceperunt
sequentes Presbyteri indigni inveniri ad primatus tenendos, immutata est ratio, &c.*

priority; and that was * the increase and dilatation of the Church upon occasion whereof they did ordaine Rectors or Governours, and other officers in the Church; yet this he grants, that this did differ from the former orders of the Church, and from apostolical Writ.

And this Rectorship or Priority was devolved at first from one Elder to another by Succession, when he who was in the place was removed, the next in order among the Elders Succeeded. But this was afterwards changed, and that unworthy men might not be preferred, it was made a matter of Election, and not a matter of Succession. Thus much we finde concerning the occasion of this imparity, enough to shew, it is not of Divine Authority.

*Hierom ad
Evag.*

For the second thing, the persons who brought in this Imparity: the same Authors tells us, the Presbyters themselves brought it in; witnesse Hierome *ad Evag. Alexandriae Presbyteri unum ex se electum in Excelsiori gradu collocatum, Episcopum nominabant, quomodo si exercitus Imperatorem faceret, aut Diaconi de se Archidiaconum.* The Presbyters of Alexandria did call him their Bishop, whom they had chosen from among themselves, & placed in a higher degree; as if an army should make an Emperour, or the Deacons an Archdeacon.

*Ambros. ubi
prius.*

Ambrose upon the fourth of the *Ephesians* tells us, it was done by a Councell, and although he neither name the time nor place of the Councell, yet ascribing it to a Councell he grants it not to be Apostolical: this gave occasion to others to fixe it upon Custome as Hieronym, in *Tit. and August. Epist. 19. secundum honorum vocabula quae Ecclesiae usus obtinuit Episcopatus Presbyterio major est,* And had that *πρεσβυτερια* or Prelacy had the Seal and confirmation of Divine or Apostolical Authority, Gregory Nazianzene would never in such a Pathetick manner have wished the Abolition of it, as he doth in his 28. Oration.

*Grego. Naz.
Orat. 28.*

Pag. 21, 22.

And now where is that acknowledgement, and conveyance of Imparity and Jurisdiction which saith this Remonstrant was derived from the Apostles hands, and deduced in an uninterrupted Line, unto this day: where is it? we finde no such Imparity delivered from Apostolical hands, nor acknowledged in Apostolical writings; yet had there been such an acknowledgement and conveyance of imparity: how this should have been deduced to us in an uninterrupted Line, we know not, unlesse our Bishops will draw the Line of their Pedigree through the loynes of Antichrist, and joyne issue, and mingle blood with Rome: which

it seemes they will rather doe then lose this plea for their *πορρωτινὴ* *Greg. Naz.*
αὐτοκρατορικὴ *ubi prius.* *their tyrannical prerogative, as Nazianzen calls it.*

Suffer us therefore humbly to appeale to your Honours, whether this Remonstrant hath not given sentence against himself, who is so confident of the Evidence of his cause, that he doth not feare to say, if there can be better Evidence under Heaven for any matter of fact then there is for his Episcopacy: Let EPISCOPACY BE
 FOR EVER ABANDONED OUT OF THE CHURCH OF GOD. *Pag. 22.*

SECT. VII.

YET it seems himselfe in the height of his confidence was not without Jealousies, of some thing might be spoken against his cause, therefore he seems to heare, what is spoken against it.

That the Apostles Bishops and ours are two: there was no other then a Parochial Pastor, a Preaching Presbyter without inequality, without any Rule over his brethren. Ours claime an eminent Superiority, and a power of Ordination and Iurisdiction unknowne to the Primitive times. *Pag. 23.*

That this which he supposeth he heares us say is Scripture Truth we have shewed already, &c. that there was a parity between Presbyters and Bishops: and that eminent superiority and power of Ordination and Iurisdiction which our Bishops claime, was unknown to Scripture: and are now prepared by Gods assistance to prove, it was unknown to primitive times.

But how doth this Remonstrant meete with this Reply: ALAS, ALAS, HOW GOOD PEOPLE may be abused by misinformation! It seemes the man Judged this Reply so poor as in his thoughts it was more worthy of his pitty, then of his paines to answer, or rather knew there was more in this Reply, then he knew how to answer, and therefore waves it with his *Rhetoricke*. *Pag. 23.*

And this we rather think, because he knows but little in *Antiquity*, that knows not, that there is so vast a difference between our Bishops, and those that were not onely in the Apostles dayes (whom we have proved to be undistinguished from Presbyters) But those Bishops that were in the Church 400. yeares after, when there began to be some discrimination, that *Episcopacy* may well be likened to the Ship *Argo*, that was so often repaired, as there was nothing left of the *First Materials*; yet still it challenged the *first Name*.

Which difference we spread before your Honours in three particulars: first in point of Election to their office; secondly, in point of Execution of their office; thirdly, in point of State-Employment.

First (having discovered already upon what occasion this priority began to have existence in the Church, and from whom it first

* *Plebs ipsa*
Maximè habet
potestatem vel
Eligendi. Dig-
nos Sacerdotes,
vel indignos re-
cusandi, quod
et ipsum Viden-
mus de Divina
Authoritate de-
scendere: ut
sacerdos plebe
presente sub om-
nium oculis de-
ligatur, et dig-
nus atque ido-
neus publico Iu-
dicio ac testimo-
nio comprobetur.
 By Priests the
 Authour here
 understands
 Bishops, as the
 whole Series
 of the Epistle
 shews.

κατὰ τὸ
 ἐκκλησιαστικὸς
 κανόνας, καὶ κατὰ
 τὸ πᾶν πᾶν
 ρήμα, —
 πάντα κανονι-
 κῶς ἐξετάσθη-
 νοι τε, καὶ
 παρὰ τὸν
 πατριάρχην
 ἀποφασισθέν-
 τας καὶ κλη-
 ρικῶν —
 τῶν κατὰ τὸ
 ἐκκλησιαστικὸς
 κανόνας πατρι-
 ἀρχῶν, καὶ τῶν
 ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας
 ἀναγε-
 ζομένων.

Athanas. Epist.
 ad Orthodoxos.

received its being, not from God but from Consent and Custom of the Churches, according to Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, &c.) We come now to Declare what was the manner of Election unto this Priority in these times, and to shew first, how therein these Bishops did differ from ours; for all their Elections were ordered by the privacy, consent, and approbation of the people, where the Bishops was to serve. Were there no other Authors to make this good, Cyprian alone would doe it, among other places let his 68. Epistle witness, where he saith * *plebs Maximè habet potestatem, &c.* The people specially have power either of chusing worthy Priests, or rejecting the unworthy: for this is derived from Divine Authority, that the Priests should be chosen in the presence of the people, before all their eyes and approved as fit and worthy by their publike vote and Testimony. This he proves by the Testimony of Sacred writ both Old and New. Where we observe first, that the special power of Judging of the worthiness or unworthiness of a man for the Prelacy was in the breast of the People. Secondly, the special power of choosing or rejecting eo his place according as they Judged him worthy or unworthy resided in the People. *Plebs maximè Habet potestatem, &c.* Thirdly, that this power did descend upon the People *De Divina Authoritate.*

Nor was this the Judgement of one Sole man, but of an Affrican Synod consulted by the Spanish Churches in point of Election, as the inscription of the Epistle shewes.

a The Obtrusion of a Bishop upon the Church of Alexandria without the Presence, desire and vote of the Clergy or People is condemned by Athanasius not onely as a breach of Canon, but as a Transgression of Apostolical prescript, and that it did compel or necessitate the heathen to blaspheme.

Nor did onely Christian Bishops, but Christian Princes acknowledge the Right and power of Election of Bishops to be in the People, so that admired Constantine the great Promover and Patron of the peace of the Christian Church writing to the Church of Nicomedia against Eusebius, and Theognius, tells them the ready way to lay asleep the Tumults that did then disturb the Church about the Election of a Bishop was, *si modo Episcopum fidelem & integrum natum fuerint, quod quidem in presentia in vestrum est potestate, quodque etiam dudum penes vestrum Iudicium fuerat, nisi Eusebius de quo dixi pravo corum, qui cum iuverunt Consilio hac præceptis videret & rectum Eligendi Ordinem impudenter conturbasset.* Gelas in Añ, Concil. Nicen. part. 3. if they would get a faithful and upright Bishop which faith he, is in your power presently to doe; and was long agoe, if Eusebius with the aide of his faction, had not rushed in upon you, and im-

impudently disturbed the right Order of Election.

That which this sacred Emperour calls the right order of Election, what is it but the Election by the people? in whose power, he saith it then was and long had been to choose a Bishop; and by whose power the next Bishop was chosen. So the same Author tells us, that after Eusebius and Theognius were cast out of their several seats for *Arianisme*, by the Council of Nice, others were appointed in their rooms by the Clergy and people of each Diocese. *Idem ubi supra.*

To this Election in *Nicomedia*, we could (if it were needful in so cleare a Truth) adde many the like Prefidents of popular Elections; which for brevities sake, we passe over. Not questioning, but that which hath been spoken, is sufficient to informe the intelligent Reader, that our Bishops and the Bishops of former times, are TWO in point of Election. *Cyprian, Cornelius, Athanasius and others.*

SECT. VIII.

A Second thing wherein we have undertaken to shew, that our Bishops and the Bishops of former times are TWO, is in the Execution of their Office: and here there are three things, wherein he that will not wilfully shut his eyes against all light, may see a Latitude of difference between ours and former Bishops. First, in that *Sole Iurisdiction* which our Bishops assume to themselves. Secondly, in the *Delagation* they make of the power of exercising this Jurisdiction unto others. Thirdly, in the way of the exercise of that power.

For the first of these, *Their sole Iurisdiction*; That our Bishops assume this to themselves, it is known and felt, and that this *Sole Iurisdiction* was a stranger, a Monster to former times, we shall now prove, and make cleare; that the power of *Ordination*, *Admonition*, *Excommunication*, *Absolution*, was not in the hands of any sole man.

First, for *Ordination*, *Cyprian* in his exile writing to his Charge, *Cyp. Epist. 33.* certifies them, that *Aurelius* was ordained by him and his Colleagues, who were present with him; (who were these Colleagues, but his Presbyters; as he himself expounds it, writing to *Lucius* in his own name, and the name of his Clergy and people, *Ego & Collega Epist. 58.* & fraternitas omnis, &c. I and my Colleagues and my whole people send these Letters to you, &c. So that it is cleare in *Cyprians* time, Presbyters had a hand in *Ordination*, and Bishops did not Ordaine alone. *Firmilianus* saith of them that rule in the Church, *Quod baptizandi, MANUM IMPONENDI ET ORDINANDI, possident potestatem.* *Apud Cyp. Epist. 75.* And who those he, he expresth a little before, *SENIORES & Præpositi*; by whom the Presbyters as well as the Bishops are understood.

And

And as these places prove, that Bishops in the Primitive time, could not ordain alone without the Presbyters; so there are that give us light to understand, that the Presbyters might ordain without the Bishop. The Author of the Comment upon the Ephesians, that goes under the name of of Ambrose, saith, *Apud Egyptum Presbyteri consignant, si praesens non sit Episcopus, In Egypt the Presbyters ordain, if the Bishop be not present*; so saith Augustine in the same words; and the* Corepiscopus, who was but a Presbyter, had power to impose hands, and to ordaine within his precincts, with the Bishops Licence. Now Licences confer not a power to him that hath it not, but only a faculty to exercise that power he hath.

The iniquity of our times hath been such, that a Minister may not Preach to his own flock, without a Licence: doth this Licence make a man a Minister, and give him power to preach, or only a faculty and liberty to exercise that power? Should a Bishop give a Laike a Licence to preach, or to ordain, doth that Licence make him a Minister, or a Bishop? Sure all will say, no: why? because in the Laike there is not *Adus primus*, the root and principle of that power, which Licence onely opens a way to the exercise of; and therefore that must be concluded to be in those Corepiscopi; or Presbyters, by vertue of their place and calling, and not by vertue of a Licence. So that the power of Ordination was so farre from residing in the Bishop alone, as that the Presbyters and Corepiscopi had power to ordain as well as he.

Neither was this onely a matter of Ecclesiastical custome, but of Ecclesiastical constitution, which bids the Bishop;

First, in all his Ordinations to consult with his Clergy; *Ut Episcopus sine Concilio Clericorum suorum Clericos non ordinet: That the Bishop shall not ordain a Clergy man without the counsel of the Clergy*: this was Cyprians practice, *Epist. 33.*

Secondly, in his Ordinations to take the concurrent assistance of his Presbyters; *Cum ordinatur Presbyter, Episcopo eum benedicente, & manum super caput eius tenente, etiam omnes Presbyteri qui praesentes sunt, manus suas juxta manum Episcopi super caput illius teneant.* When a Presbyter is ordained, the Bishop blessing him, and holding his hand upon his head, all the Presbyters that are present, shall likewise lay their hands upon his head, with the hands of the Bishop. In which Canon, we have the unanimous vote of two hundred and fourteen Bishops, declaring that the power of Ordination is in the hands of Presbyters as well as Bishops.

And whereas it may be objected, that Hierome and Chrysostome, affirming Bishops to differ from Presbyters in the power of Ordination,

Cum jure Divi-
no non sint di-
versi gradus
Episcopis & Pa-
storibus: Mani-
festum est ordi-
nationem in sua
Ecclesia factam
JURE DI-
VINO RA-
TAM esse.

Itaque cum E-
piscopi ordina-
rii fiant hostes
Ecclesiae aut no-
lunt ordinationem
impertire,
Ecclesia retinet
jus suum. Mel-
lanch. ubi su-
pra, pag. Concil.
Antios. Can. 10.
& Ancy. Can.
13.

Concil. 4. Ca-
thag.
Can. 22.

2.
Ibid. Can. 3.

Hieronym. in
Epist. ad Evag.
Chrysost. Hom.
11. in 1. ad
Tim.

nation, seem to imply, that that power is soly theirs : Here wee desire it may be observed.

First, that these Fathers put all the difference that lies betweene Bishops and Presbyters, to be in point of Ordination. *Quid facit Episcopus, quod non facit Presbyter exceptâ Ordinatione.* And therefore Chrysostome himselfe confesseth, that in his days there was little or no difference between a Bishop and a Presbyter. *Inter Episcopum & presbyterum interest ferme nihil, &c.*

Chrysost. upon the 1. Tim.

Secondly, That this difference is not so to be understood, as if these Fathers did hold it to be by divine right (as Bellarmine and our Episcopall men would make us beleve) but by a humane constitution. And therefore they do not speak *De jure* but *de facto*, *Quid facit, &c.* not *quid debet facere.* And this Hierom confesseth. So Leo *Libro de sep- tem Ordinibus.* prim. ep. 88. upon complaints of unlawful Ordinations, writing to the Germane and French Bishops, reckons up what things are reserved to the Bishops, among which he set down *Presbyterorum & Diaconorum consecratio*, and then addes, *Que omnia solis deberi summis Pontificibus Auctoritate Canonam præcipitur:* So that for this power of Ordination, they are more beholden to the Canon of the Church, then to the Canon of Gods Word.

Concil. Aquis- gra. 1. Can. 8. Solum propter auctoritatem Clericorum ordinationis & consecratio reservata est summo Sacerdoti.

Thirdly, we answer that this very humane difference was not in the Primitive Antiquity. It was not so in Cyprians time, as we even now shewed. And when it did prevaile, it was but a particular custome (and sometimes usurpation) of some Churches. For it was otherwise appointed in the Councel of Carthage, and in Egypt, and other places, as is declared in the former part of this Section; and even in Chrysostomes time, it was so little approved of, that it was one great accusation against Chrysostome himselfe, That he made Ordinations without the Presbytery, and without the consent of his Clergy; this is quoted by Bishop Downame, lib. 1. cap. 8. pag. 176.

SECT. IX.

Nor had the Bishops of former times more right to the power of sole Jurisdiction, then of sole Ordination: And here we have *Consentientem reum*, our very Adversaries confess the Votes of Antiquity are with us.

Bislon. Spalat. Franc. à Sancta Clara. Cyp. Epist. 6. &c. 28.

Cyprian professeth, that he would do nothing without the Clergy; nay, he could do nothing without them; nay, he durst not take upon him alone to determine that which of right did belong to all; and had he or any other done so, the fourth Councel of Carthage condemns the Sentence of the Bishop, as *Irrita nisi Clericorum sententiâ confirmetur.*

18. Concil. 4. Carthag. Can. 23. Vid Russ. Hist. lib. 10. cap. 9. Sozo. l. 2. c. 23. Possiden. de vita. Aug. c. 4. Orig. Hom. 11. in Exo. pag. 97.

Would ye know the particulars, wherein the Bishops had no power of Judicature without their Presbyters.

First

1
Decret. part. 2.
Can. 15. quæ. 7.
Per totum &
partes Dist. 93.
cap. 5, 6.

2
Clem. Alex.
Stromat. lib. 7.

Tertul. Apol.
ad vers. Gent.

Ambros. Epist.
ad Syagrium.

Aug. de verb.
Apost. Ser. 19.

* Constat. Iurisdictionem illam excommunicandi reos manifestorum criminum pertinere ad omnes Pastores, hanc ad se solos tyrannice transtulerunt, & ad questum contulerunt Episcopi, Melanc. ubi sup.

b Hieron. Epist.
ad Heliodor.
Ep. ad Demet.

First, in judging and censuring Presbyters themselves, and their Doctrine; For this the Canon Law in *Gratian* is full and cleare: *Episcopus non potest iudicare Presbyterum vel Diaconum sine Synodo & Senioribus*: Thus *Basil* counselled and practised, *epist. 75*. So *Ambr. lib. 10. epist. 80*. *Cyril in epist. ad Iohannem Antiochen.* Thus *Gregory ad Iohan. Panor mitan. lib. 11. epist. 49*.

Secondly, in judging of the conversation or crimes of any of the members of the Church: *Penes Presbyteros est Disciplina que facit homines meliores*; That Discipline that workes emendation in men, is in the power of the Elders. And therefore when any was questioned in point of conversation, he was brought, saith *Tertulian*, into the Congregation where were Exhortations, Castigations, and Divine censures: And who had the chiefe stroke in these Censures, he tells us after: *President probati quique seniores*: All the approved Elders sit as Presidents.

And those censures that passed by the whole Presbytery were more approved by the Church in ancient times, then such as were passed by one man; for we finde that when *Syagrius* and *Ambrose* passed Sentence in the same case, the Church was unsatisfied in the Sentence of *Syagrius*, because he past it *sine alicujus fratris consilio*, without the counsel or consent of any of his Brethren. But were pacified with the sentence of Saint *Ambrose*: because, saith he, *Hoc Iudicium Nostrium cum fratribus & sacerdotibus participatum processerit*.

Nor was there any kinde of censures that the Bishops did administer alone: Admonitions were given by the Elders; *Augustine* tells us the Elders did admonish such as were offenders; to the same purpose speaks. *Origen. contra Celsum. Lib. 3*.

* So excommunication, though that being the dreadfulest thunder of the Church, and as *Tertullian* calls it, *summum præjudicium futuri Iudicij*, the great fore-runner of the Judgement of God, was never vibrated but by the hand of those that laboured in the Word and Doctrine: yet was no one man in the Church invested with this power more then another.

Therefore saith *b Hierom*; *Presbytero si peccaverit licet me tradere satanae in interitum carnis*. If I sinne, a Presbyter (not a Bishop only) may deliver me to Satan, to the destruction, &c. where the Reader may please to take notice that Saint *Hierom* speaks not of one particular Presbyter, but of the Order of Presbyters.

The same *S. Hierom* saith againe, *Sant quos Ecclesia reprehendit, quos interdum abiicit, in quos non nunquam Episcoporum & Clericorum censura deservit*. There be some whom the Church reproves, and some which she casts out; against whom the censures of Bishops and Presbyters sharply proceed; where we see, the Censures whereby wicked

wicked men were cast out of the Church, were not in the sole hands of the Bishops, but likewise in the hands of Presbyters.

Syricius Bishop of Rome signifies to the Church of Millaine, that *Iovinianus, Auxentius, &c.* were cast out of the Church for ever, and he sets down how they did it, *Omnium Nostrium tam Presbyterorum quam Diaconorum, quam totius etiam cleri sciscitata fuit sententia.* There was a concurrence of all Presbyters, Deacons, and the whole Clergy in that sentence of Excommunication. Ambros. lib. 10. Epist. 80.

The truth herein may be further evidenced by this, because the whole Clergy as well as the Bishops imposed hands upon such, as repenting were absolved: *Nec ad communicationem (saith Cyprian) venire quis possit, nisi prius ab Episcopo & Clero Manus illi fuerit imposita: No man that hath been excommunicated might returne to Church-Communion, before hands had been laid upon him by the Bishop and Clergy.* Cyprian. Epist. 12. And this was the custome, saith Cyprian in minoribus delictis.

Also writing to his Clergy concerning lapsed Christians, he tells them, *Exomologesi facta & manu eis à vobis in penitentiam imposita, &c.* that after confession and the laying on their hands, they might be commended unto God: so when certaine returning from their heresie were to be received into the Church at Rome in the time of *Cornelius*, they came before the Presbytery, and therefore confessed their sinnes, and so were admitted. Cyprian. Epist. 45. vide etiam Cyprian. Epist. 6.

But though the sentence of Excommunication was managed onely by the hand of those that laboured in the Word and Doctrine, yet we will not conceale from you, that neither Excommunication nor absolution did passe without the knowledge and approbation of the body of the Church, to which the Delinquent did belong.

So we have learned out of *Tertullian*, that their censures were ordered in their publike assemblies; and good reason, because the people were to forbear communion with such. *2 Thes. 3. 6, 14, 15.* and publike censures of the Church were inflicted not onely for the Emendation of delinquents, but for the admonition of others, and therefore ought to be admistred in publike that others might feare, *1 Tim. 5. 20.* *Origen* speaking of the Duty and Power of the Church in cutting off a scandalous Person though a Presbyter, making the case his own, he saith thus: *In uno consensu Ecclesia universa conspirans excidat me dextram suam & projiciat a se,* He would have the consent of the whole Church in that Act. Tertullian. Adv. Gent. cap. 59. Origen. Ham. 7. in Iosb.

And when the lapsed Christians were received againe into the Church, the Peoples consent was required therein; else why should *Cyprian* say, *Vix plebi persuadeo imò extorqueo ut tales patientur admitti:* I can scarce perswade the people to suffer such to be admitted: and in another Epistle written to his people in his Banishment, he promiseth to examine all things, they being present and judging. *Examinabuntur singula presentibus & judicantibus vobis.* Cyprian. Epist. 55. Cyprian. Epist. 11. ad plebem.

But of this power of the People we shall have a further occasion to

ſpeak afterwards, when we come to diſcourſe of *Governing Elders*.

Onely may it pleaſe your Honours from hence to take notice; how unjuſtly our Biſhops have invaded this right and power of Presbyters and people in Church cenſures, and deſteſting both of it, have girt it wholly upon themſelves, and how herein they and the Biſhops of former times are T W O.

SECT. X.

And as our Biſhops, and the Biſhops of former times are T W O in point of *Sole Jurisdiction*, ſo alſo in the *Delegation* of this power of *Jurisdiction* unto others: to their Chancellours, Commiſſaries, Officers, &c. Was ever ſuch a thing as this heard of in the beſt primitive Times? that *men that never received impoſition of hands*, ſhould not only be received into aſſiſtance, but be wholly intruſted with the power of *Spiritual Jurisdiction*: Even then when it is to be exerciſed over ſuch perſons as have had hands laid upon them.

*Indecorū
eſt Laicum
vicarium
eſſe Epiſco-
pi, & ſe-
culares in
Eccleſiā
judicare: in
ano enim
eodemque
opere non
decet diſpar
profeſſio
quod etiam
in lege Di-
vina pro-
hibetur di-
cente Mo-
ſe, Non ara-
bis in bove
q̄y aſino
ſimul, Con-
cil. Hiſpal.
2.

We may obſerve in *Cyprian*, whilſt perſecution ſeparated him from his Church, when queſtions did ariſe among his people, he doth not ſend them to his Chancellour or Commiſſary; No, he was ſo far from ſubſtituting any man (much leſſe a *lay man*) to determine or give Judgement in ſuch caſes, that he would not aſſume that power wholly to himſelf, but ſuſpends his Judgement, till the hand of God ſhould reſtore him to his Church againe, that with the advice and Counſel of the Presbyters, he might give ſentence: as may appeare to any that ſhall peruſe his Epistles.

Sure if God had ever led his Church to ſuch a way of deputation, it would have been in ſuch a caſe of Neceſſity as this was: or had any footſteps of ſuch a courſe as this been viſible by this holy Martyr in the goings of former ages, he needed not have deferred the determination of the queſtion about the receiving of ſome penitent lapſed ones into the boſome of the Church again, till his returne and the returne of his Clergy, as he doth.

Cypr. Epist
28.

We will inſtance in his 28 Epistle, wherein giving direction for the excommunicating of ſuch as would raſhly communicate with lapſed Chriſtians, he gives this charge not to his Chancellour or Commiſſary, or any other man upon whom he had devolved his power, and ſet him as his *Deputy or Vicar generall* in his abſence, but *ad clerum*, to the whole Presbytery.

Downham
in the de-
fence of

This Truth is ſo cleare, that Biſhop Downham the great Advocate of Episcopacy confeſſeth, that in *Ambroſe* his time, and a good while after (which was about 400 years) till the Presbyters were in a manner

SECT. XI.

A Third branch wherein the difference between our Bishops, and the Bishops of former times, in point of Exercising their Jurisdiction, is visible, is the way or manner of exercising that power.

For brevities sake we will onely instance in their proceedings in causes criminal; where let them tell us, whether any good *Antiquity* can yeild them one President for THEIR OATH EX OFFICIO, which hath been to their COURTS, as Purgatory fire to the Popes Kitchen: they have forgotten that old Maxime in the Civil Law, *Nemo tenetur prodere seipsum*, which as it is grounded upon natural equity, so it is confirmed by a Law enacted by *Dioclesian* and *Maximilian*, *Nimis grave est quod petitis*, &c. It is too grievous that the adverse party should be required to the exhibition of such things as should create trouble to themselves. Understand therefore that you ought to bring proofes of your intentions, and not to extort them from your adversaries against themselves.

Cod. li. 4.
Tit. 20.
l. 7.

Shall the Lamp of Nature in the night of Ethnicisme enable Heathen Princes, (yea Persecutors) to see and enact thus much, and shall not the glorious Sunne of the Gospel convince these of their iniquities in transgressing this Law, that call themselves the Fathers of the Church?

If neither the light of Nature, nor Gospel light can, yet the custome of the Church, to which they so oft appeal, may both convince them of this iniquity, and discovr to all the world the contrariety of their proceedings, to the proceedings of former times, in this particular.

For of Old, both the Plantiffe and Defendant were brought face to face, before the parties, in whose power it was to judge: which way *Athanasius* affirms to be according to Scripture, the Law of God. And because those that condemned *Macarius*, did not thus proceed, he condemnes their Sentence as malicious and unjust.

Athanas.
Apol. 2.

Of old, no Sentence passed against any man, but upon the Testimony of other witnesses besides the Accusers: after complaint exhibited, the first thing they applyed themselves to, was to consider the person and quality of the Accuser, *Concil. prim. Constant. Can. 6* Then they heard the witnesses, who were two at least, *Can. Apost. Can. 75*. And these witnesses must be such, as might not be imagined to be partiall, nor to beare enmity nor malice against the party accused. *Ambros. Epist. 64.* so *Gratian*, *Caus. 3. quæ. 5. cap. Quod suspecti.*

Apost.
naram.

Of old, None might be party, witnesse, and Judge, which *Gratian* proves at large. *Caus. 4. quæ. 4. cap. Nullus unquam præsumat accusator simul esse, & Judex & testis,*

Greg. Decret. lib. 3.
Tit. 2. cap. 8. quæ vos.
Decret.
Greg. lib. 5
Tit. 4. cap.

We grant indeed the Canon Law permits in some cases Tryal without witnesses; *Si crimen. ita publicum est, ut merito debeat appellari notorium*; If the crime be so publike, that it may deservedly be called Notorious. Which Law further determines what is notorious, saying, *Offensam illam nos intelligimus manifestam, quæ vel per confessionem vel probationem*

24.

bationem legitime nota fuerit, aut evidentia Rei, quæ nulla possit tergiversatione celari; We count that offence manifest, which either by confession, or by lawful proof comes to be known, or by evidence of fact, so as it can be hid by no tergiversations.

So that all was done in former times with mature deliberation, upon examination and evidence produced, and proved by such witnesses, as against whom the Defendant could lay in no just exception. And not as now an Accusation whispered against a man, he knowes not by whom, to which he must take his oath to answer, before he knows what his Accusation is. Which Oath, if he takes, without further witness, he is censured upon the witness of his own Oath. If he takes it not, he is sent presently to prison, there to lye without Bayle or Mainprize, till the insupportable miseries of his long durance, compel him to take on Oath against Nature, Scripture, Conscience, and the just Defence of his own innocency.

That our Bishops therefore and former Bishops are *Two*, in the point of executing their Judicatory power, we need spend no more time to prove. But come to the third thing, in which the difference between ours and former Bishops is to be evidenced.

SECT. XII.

And that is State Employment, or attendance upon Civil and Secular affaires, &c. which both Christ and Saint Paul prohibits, which prohibition reacheth every Bishop (to speake in *Chrysostomes* words) as well as *Timothy*, to whom it is directed; *Nullus ergo Episcopatu præditus hæc audire detrectet, sed agere ea omnia detrectet*. Let no man that is a Bishop, refuse to hear what the Apostle saith, but to doe what the Apostle forbids.

*Chrysost:
Hom. 40.
in 2, Tim*

We deny not but that Bishops were in the Primitive times often incumbered with secular business: but these were put upon them, sometimes by Emperors, who sought the ruine of the Church, as *Julian*, of whom *Niceph. lib. 10. cap. 13.* doth report, that in *Clerum coaptatos Senatorum munere & ministerio perversè fangi jussit*. Sometimes the gracious disposition of Princes toward Christian Religion, made them thus to honour Bishops, thinking thereby to advance Religion: as *Constantine* the Great enacted, that such as were to be tryed before Civil Magistrates, might have leave to appeale *ad Iudicium Episcoporum*, *atque eorum sententiam ratam esse tanquam ab ipso Imperatore prolatum*, And this the Historian reckoneth as one argument of his reverend respect to Religion. Sometimes the excellency of their singular parts cast civil dignities upon them. *Tiberius* granted a *Questors dignity* unto a Bishop for his eloquence: *Chrysostome* for his notable stoutness and freedom of speech, was sent as the fittest man to *Gainas*, with the Emperors command. Sometimes the people observing the Bishops to be much honoured by the Emperour, would sollicit them to present their grei-

*Recording this among those things that he did Dolo modo ducere.
more xvi as,
Sozo. l. 9.
Niceph. 18.
Sh*

command or Administration of Military affaires or civil place (as *Zonaras* there) he should be desposed, *Can. Apo. Can. 83.* hiring of ground, meddling with worldly affaires is to be laid aside by them. Otherwise they are threatned to be liable to Ecclesiastical censures, *Conc. Cal. Can. 3. Conc. Carth. Can. 16.*

We will adde this for a conclusion in this point, it is observed by *Athanasius, Salpitiu, Severus*, and other Ecclesiastical Historians, that the *Arians* were very expedite in worldly affaires, which experience they gained by their constant following and attendance upon the Emperours Court; and what troubles they occasioned to the Church thereby, is notoriously known to any that have seen the Histories of their times. And in this our Bishops have approved themselves more like to the *Arian* Bishops then the purer Bishops of purer times: but how ever cleare it is, that our Bishops and the Bishops of former times are Two: Two in election to their offices, Two in the discharge of their offices, Two in their Ordination, Jurisdiction, Processes, Censures, Administrations; and the difference between our Bishops and those of former times, is greater then between the great Bishop of Rome and them.

SECT. XIII.

But it seemes our Remonstrant soared above these times even as high as the Apostles dayes, for so he saith, *If our Bishops challenge any other spiritual power, then was by Apostolike Authority delegated to, and required of Timothy and Titus, and the Angels of the seven Asian Churches, let them be DISCLAIMED as USURPERS.* And the truth is, so they deserve to be, if they doe but challenge the same power that the Apostle did delegate to *Timothy* and *Titus*; for *Timothy* and *Titus* were Evangelists, and so moved in a Sphere above Bishops or Presbyters. For *Timothy*, it is cleare from the letter of the Text, 2 *Tim. 4. 5.* ἐργον ποιῶν ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἔργου: Doe the work of an Evangelist: if *Timothy* had been but a Presbyter or Bishop, Paul had here put him upon imployment, *Ultra Spheram Activitatis.*

a Let the Reader please to consult *Euseb. Hist. lib. 3: cap. 33.* according to some, after others *cap. 37.* and view the description, he there makes of an Evangelist, and then judge of what we speak.

And to any man, that will but understand and consider what the Office of an * Evangelist was; and wherein it differed from the Office of a Presbyter or Bishop, it will be manifest that *Timothy* and *Titus* were Evangelists, and no Bishops: for the title of Evangelist is taken but two wayes; either for such as wrote the Gospel, and so we doe not affirme *Timothy* and *Titus*, to be Evangelists: or else for such as taught the Gospel; and those were of two sorts, either such as had ordinary places and ordinary gifts, or such whose places and gifts were extraordinary; and such Evangelists were *Timothy* and *Titus*, and not Bishops, as will appeare if we consider, what was the Difference between the Evangelists and Bishops. Bishops or Presbyters were tyed to the particular care and tuition of that flock over which God had made them Overseers, *Acts 20. 28.* But Evangelists were not tyed to reside in one particular place, but did attend

rend upon the *Apostles* by whose appointment they are sent from place to place, as the necessity of the Churches did require. As appears first in *Timothy* whom Saint *Paul* besought to abide at *Ephesus*, 1. *Tim.* 1. 3. which had beene needlesse importuniy, if *Timothy* had the *Episcopall* (that is the *Pastorall*) charge of *Ephesus* committed to him by the *Apostles*, for then he might have laid as dreadful a Charge upon him to abide at *Ephesus*, as he doth to. Preach the Gospel. But so far was *Paul* from setting *Timothy* in *Cathedra* in *Ephesus*, that he rather continually sends him up and down upon all Church-services, for we finde *Acts.* 17. 14. that when *Paul* fled Anno, from the tumults of *Berea* to *Athens*, he left *Silas* and *Timothy* behinde *Acre*. him, who afterwards coming to *Paul* to *Athens*, *Paul* sends *Timothy* *Christi* from *Athens* to *Thessalonica*, to confirm the *Thessalonians* in the faith, as receiv^e, appears 1 *Thes.* 3. 1. 2. from whence returning to *Paul* to *Athens* again, 47. the *Apostle* *Paul* before he left *Athens* and went to *Corinth*, sent him and *Silas* into *Macedonia*, who returned to him again to *Corinth*, *Act.* 18. Anno 48
5. afterwards they travelled to *Ephesus*, from whence we read *Paul* sent *Timothy* and *Erastus* into *Macedonia*, *Act.* 19. 22. wither *Paul* went Anno 51 after them, and from whence they and divers other Brethren journeyed into *Asia*, *Acts.* 20. 4. All which Brethren *Paul* calls, as it is probable, *Ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν*, the messengers of the Churches, 2. *Cor.* 8. 23. Anno 53
And being thus accompanied with *Timothy*, and the rest of the Bretheren he comes to *Miletum*, and calls the *Elders* of the Church of *Ephesus* thither to him, of which Church had *Timothy* been *Bishop*, the *Apostle* in stead of giving the *Elders* a charge to feed the flock of *Christ*, would have given that charge to *Timothy*, and not to them. Anno 53

And secondly, the *Apostle* would not so have forgotten himself, as to call the *Elders* *Επισκόπους*, before their *Bishops* face.

Thirdly, It is to be conceived, the *Apostles* would have given them some directions, how to carry themselves towards their *Bishop*; but not a word of this though *Timothy* were then in *Pauls* presence, and in the presence of the *Elders*. The cleare evidence of which Text demonstrates, that *Paul* did not leave *Timothy* at this time as *Bishop* of *Ephesus*. *Phraus.*
But it is rather evident that he took him along with him in his journey *Capellus.* to *Hierusalem*, and so to *Rome*; for we find that those *Epistles* *Paul* wrote *Heb.* 13. while he a prisoner, bear either in their inscription or some other passage of them, the name of *Timothy* as *Pauls* companion, viz. The *Epistle* to the *Philippians*, *Colossians*, *Hebrewes*, *Philemon*, which *Epistles* he wrote not onely that *Timothy* was in bonds as the contexture, which those two learned professors, the one at *Heydelburg*, the other at *Saulmur*, make of Saint *Pauls* *Epistles*, with *Paul* doth declare. Anno 53
but a prisoner

So that it appears that *Timothy* was no *Bishop*, but a *Minister*, an *Evangelist*, a fellow labourer of the *Apostles*, 1 *Thes.* 3. 1. an *Apostle*, a *Messenger* of the Church, 2 *Cor.* 8. 3. a *Minister* of God, 1 *Thes.* 3. 2. these titles

titles the Holy Ghost gives him, but never the title of a *Bishop*.

The like we finde in Scripture concerning *Titus*, whom *Paul* as it is conceived by learned men, did first assume into the fellowship of his Labors in the place of *John*, and made him his companion in his journey through *Antioch* a to *Hierusalem*, b so we find *Gal. 2. 1.* from thence returning to *Antioch* againe; from thence he passed through *Syria* and *Cilicia*, confirming the Churches; and from *Cilicia*, he passed to *Crete*, where having Preached the Gospel, and plained Churches, he left *Titus* * there for a while, to set in order things that remaine,

* Anno 46 Yet it was but for a while he left him there, for in his Epistle which he wrote to him not many yeares after, he injoynes him to come to him * Anno 51 to *Nicopolis* * where he did intend to winter, but changing that purpose sends for him to *Ephesus*, where it seemes his Hyemal station was, and from thence sends him before him to *Corinth*, to enquire the state * Anno 51 of the *Corinthians* *. His returne from thence *Paul* expects at *Troas* *, and * Anno 52 because comming thither he found not his expectation there, he was so grieved in his spirit, 2 *Cor. 2. 12.* that he passed presently from thence into *Macedonia*, where *Titus* met him; and in the midst of his afflictions joyed his spirits with the glad tydings of the powerful and gracious effects, his first Epistle had among the *Corinthians*, 2 *Cor. 7. 5, 6, 7.* *Paul* having there collected the Liberalities of the Saints, sends *Titus* againe * Anno 53 to the * *Corinthians*, to prepare them for the same service of Ministring to the necessities of the Saints, 2 *Cor. 8. 6.* And makes him with some others the Conveyers of that second Epistle to the *Corinthians*.

All these journeyes to and fro did *Titus* make at the designment of the Apostle, even after he was left in *Crete*. Nor doe we finde, that after his first removal from *Crete* *; he did ever returne thither. We read indeed, 2 *Tim. 4. 10.* he was with *Paul* at *Rome*, and from thence returned * Anno 54 not to *Crete*, but into *Dalmatia*. All which doth more then probably shew, it never was the Intendment of the Apostle to fix *Titus* in *Crete* as a Bishop, but onely to leave him there for a season for the good of that Church, and to call him from thence, and send him abroad to other Churches for their good, as their necessities might require. Now who that will acknowledge a Distinction between the Offices of Bishops and Evangelists, and knows wherein that Distinction lyes, will not upon these premisses conclude that *Timothy* and *Titus* were Evangelists and NO T Bishops.

I but some of the Fathers have called *Timothy* and *Titus* Bishops. We grant it true; and it is as true, that some of the Fathers have called them Archbishops and Patriarks; yet it doth not follow, they were so. We adde, secondly, that when the Fathers did call them so, it was not in a proper but in an improper sense; which we expresse in the words of our Learned Orthodox Reynolds;

Raynolds
contra Hæret
Ca: 6:

You may learne by the Fathers themselves, saith he, that when they termed

termed any Apostle a Bishop of this or that City (as namely *S. Peter of Antioch or Rome*) they meant it in a general sort and signification, because they did attend that Church for a time, and supply that roome in preaching the Gospel, which Bishops did after; but as the name of Bishop is commonly taken for the *Overseer* of a particular Church, and Pastor of a several flock; so *Peter* was not Bishop of any one place; therefore not of *Rome*. And this is true by *Analogy* of all extraordinary Bishops, and the same may be said of *Timothy* and *Titus*, that he saith of *Peter*.

But were it true that *Timothy* and *Titus* were Bishops: will this Remonstrant undertake, that all his party shall stand to his Conditions? If our Bishops challenge any other power then was by Apostolick Authority delegated to, and required of *Timothy* and *Titus*, and the Angels of the seven Asian Churches, let them be disclaimed as usurpers. Will our Bishops indeed stand to this? then *actum est*. Did ever Apostolick Authority delegate power to *Timothy* or *Titus*, to ordain alone? to governe alone? and do not our Bishops challenge that power? Did ever Apostolique Authority delegate power to *Timothy* and *Titus*, to rebuke an Elder? no; but to entreat him as a Father: and do not our Bishops challenge themselves and permit to their Chancellors, Commissaries, and Officials power not only to Rebuke an Elder, but to rayle upon an Elder? to reproach him with the most opprobrious termes of *foole, knave, jack-sauce, &c.* which our paper blushes to present to your Honors view? Did ever Apostolick Authority delegate to *Timothy* and *Titus* power to receive an accusation against an Elder, but before two or three witnesses? and do not our Bishops challenge power to proceed *Ex Officio*, and make Elders their own Accusers? Did ever Apostolick Authority delegate power to *Timothy* or *Titus*, to reject any after twice admonition, but an Heretick? and do not our Bishops challenge power to reject and eject the most sound and Orthodox of our Ministers, for refusing the use of a Ceremony? as if Non-conformity were Heresie. So that either our Bishops must disclaim this Remonstrance, or else themselves must be disclaimed as usurpers.

But if *Timothy* and *Titus* were no Bishops, or had not this power, it may be the Angels of the seven Asian Churches had; and our Remonstrant is so subtle as to twist these two together, that if one faile, the other may hold.

To which we answer; first, that Angel in those Epistles is put *Collectively*, not *Individually*; as appears by the Epistle to *Thyatira*, cap. 2. vers. 25. where we read *ὁ μὲν δὲ λόγος ἐπὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς*, &c. But I say unto you (in the plural number, not unto thee in the singular) and unto the rest in *Thyatira*, &c. Here is a plain distinction between the members of that Church. By you, is signified those to whom he spake under the name of the Angel. By the rest, the residue of the people. The people governed, and the Governours in the plural number. What can be more evident

so prove, that by *Angel* is meant not one singular person, but the whole company of Presbyters that were in *Thyatira*.

This also further appears, because it is usual with the holy Ghost, not only in other Books of the Scripture, but also in this very Book of the *Revelation*, to express a company under one singular person. Thus the Civil State of Rome, as opposite to Christ, is called *A beast with ten horns* : and the Ecclesiastical State Antichristian is called *the whore of Babylon*, and, *the false Prophet* ; and the Devil and all his family is called *An old red Dragon*. Thus also the seven Angels that blew the seven trumpets, *Revel. 8. 2.* and the seven Angels that poured out the seven Vials, are not literally to be taken, but Synecdochically, as all know. And why not then the seven Angels in those Epistles? Mr. Mede in his Commentaries upon the *Revelation*, pag. 265, hath these words; *Denique ut jam semel iterum; monuimus quoniam Deus adhibet angelos providentie sue in rerū humanarū motibus & conversionibus ciendis, gubernandisq; administris: idcirco, quæ multorum manibus peraguntur, Angelo tamen tanquam rei gerendæ præfidi & Duci pro communi loquendi modo tribuuntur.*

Adde, thirdly, that the very name *Angel* is sufficient to prove, that it is not meant of one person alone, because the word *Angel* doth not import any peculiar jurisdiction or preheminance, but is a common name to all Ministers, and is so used in Scripture. For all Ministers are Gods Messengers and Embassadors, sent for the good of the Elect. And therefore the name being common to all Ministers, why should wee think that there should be any thing spoken to one Minister, that doth not belong to all? The like argument we draw from the word *Stars* used *Revel. 1. 20.* *The seven Stars are the Angels of the seven Churches.* Now it is evident, that all faithful Ministers are called Stars in Scripture, whose duty is to shine as lights unto the Churches, in all purity of doctrine and holiness of conversation. And in this sense, the word is used, when it is said, that *the third part of the stars were darkned*, *Revel. 8. 12.* and that *the Dragons taile drew the third part of the stars of Heaven, and cast them to the Earth*, *Revel. 12. 4.* Which is meant not only of Bishops, but of other Ministers, unless the Bishops will appropriate all corruption and Apostacy unto themselves.

Adde, fourthly, out of the Text it selfe, it is very observable, that our Saviour in opening the mystery of the Vision, *Revel. 1. 20.* saith; *The seven Candlesticks which thou sawest, are the seven Churches*, but he doth not say, *The seven Stars are the seven Angels of the same Churches*, But *the Angels of the seven Churches*; wherein not without some mystery the number of the Angels is omitted; least we should understand by *Angel*, one Minister alone, and not a company. And yet the Septenary number of Churches is twice set down.

Lastly, though but one Angel be mentioned in the fore-front, yet it is evident, that the Epistles themselves are dedicated to all the Angels and

and Ministers in every Church, and to the Churches themselves: And if to the whole Church, much more to the Presbyters of that Church. This is proved *Revel. 1. 11. What thou seest, write in a Book, and send it to the seven Churches which are in Asia.* And also by the Epiphonema of every Epistle; *He that hath an eare to hear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches.* Upon which words, *Ambrosius Ausbertus* in his second book upon the Revelation, saith thus; *Unâ eademq; locutione & Angelos & Ecclesias unum esse designat. Nam cum in principio locutionum quæ ad septem fiunt Angelos dicat, & Angelo illius Ecclesie scribe; in fine tamen earundem non dicit, Qui habet aurem audiat quod spiritus dicat Angelo, sed quid Ecclesie dicat.* By one and the same phrase of speech he sheweth, the Angels and the Churches to be one and the same. For whereas in the beginning of his speech, which he makes to the seven Churches, he saith, *And write to the Angel of the Churches;* yet in the close of the same, he doth not say, *He that hath an eare, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the Angel,* but *what he saith to the Church.* And this is further proved by the whole argument of those Epistles, wherein the admonitions, threatnings, commendations, and reproofes, are directed to all the Ministers of all the Churches. *Revel. 2. 10. The Devil shall cast some of you into prison, &c. Revel. 2. 16. I will fight against them with the sword of my mouth, Revel. 2. 24. I will put upon you no other burthen, &c. I say unto you and the rest of Thyatira, as many as have not this Doctrine, and which have not known the depths of Satan, &c.* And when it is said in the singular Number (as it is often) *I know thy works and labour, &c. vers. 2. and vers. 4. Repent and do thy first works; and vers. 13. Thou hast not denyed my Faith, &c. and cap. 3. 26. Because thou art neither hot nor cold, &c.* All these and the like places, are not to be understood as meant of one individual person, but of the whole company of Ministers, and also of the whole Church, because that the punishment threatned, is to the whole Church; *Revel. 2. 5. Repent and do thy first works, or else I will come unto thee quickly and remove thy Candlestick out of his place; Rev. 2. 16. Repent, or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will fight against thee with the sword of my mouth; Revel. 2. 24. I will not put upon you any other burthen.* Now we have no warrant in the Word to think that Christ would remove his Gospel from a Church for the sin of one Bishop, when all the other Ministers, and the Churches themselves are free from those sins. And if God should take this course, in what woeful & miserable condition should the Church of England be, which groaneth under so many corrupt Prelates? By all this it appears, that the word *Angel*, is not to be taken, ἄγγελος, but αγγελισκός; not properly, but figuratively. And this is the judgment of Master *Perkins* upon the second Chapter of the Revelation: and of Master *Brightman*: and of Doctor *Fulke*, who in answer to the Rhemists in *Apoc. 1. 20.* hath these words: *S. Iohn by the Angels of the Churches*

meaneth not all that should wear on their heads Myters, and hold crosier staves in their hands, like dead Idols, but them that are the faithful messengers of Gods word, and utter and declare the same. Again, they are called the Angels of the Churches, because they be Gods messengers.

Master Fox likewise in his Meditation upon the *Revelation* (pag. 7.9. 17.) is of this opinion, and hath gathered to our hands the opinions of all Interpreters he could meet, and saith that they all consent in this that under the person of an Angel, the Pastors & Ministers of the Churches were understood. S. Austin in his 132. Epistle, saith thus, *Sic enim in Apocalypsi legitur Angelus, &c. Quod si de Angelo superiorum colorum, & non de Præpositis Ecclesiarum vellet intelligi, non consequenter diceret, Habeo adversum te, &c.* And so in his second Homily upon the *Revelation* (if that book be his) *Quod autem dicit Angelo Thyatiræ. Habeo adversum te pauca, dicit Præpositis Ecclesiarum, &c.* This also Gregory the Great, lib. 34. Moral. in Iob. cap. 4. *Sæpe sacram scripturam prædicatores Ecclesiæ pro eo quod patris gloriam annunciant, angelorum nomine solere designare: & hinc esse, quod Iohannes in Apocalypsi septem Ecclesiis scribens, angelis Ecclesiarum loquitur, id est, Prædicatoribus populorum.* Master Box citeth Primasius, Haymo, Bede, Richard, Thomas, and others, to whom we refer you.

If it be here demanded (as it is much by the Hierarchical side) that if by Angel be meant the whole company of Presbyters, why Christ did not say, to the Angels in the plural number, but to the Angel in the singular?

We answer, that though this question may favor of a little too much curiosity, yet we will make bold to subjoyn three conjectural reasons of this phrase of speech.

First, it is so used in this place, because it is the common language of other Scriptures in types and visions to set down a certain number for an uncertain, & the singular number for the plural. Thus the Ram, Dan. 8. 3. is interpreted vers. 20. to be the Kings of Media, and Persia. And the enemies of Gods Church are set out by four horns. And the deliverers by four Carpenters, Zach. 1. 18. 20. And the wise and foolish Virgins are said to be five wise and five foolish. And many such like. And therefore as we answer the Papists, when they demand why Christ if he meant figuratively when he saith, *this is my body*, did not speak in plain language, *this is the sign of my body*? We say, that this phrase of speech is proper to all Sacraments: So we also answer here, this phrase of speech, *Angel for Angels*, is common to all types and visions.

Secondly Angel is put, though more be meant, that so it may hold proportion with the vision which John saw, Chap. 1. 12. 20. *He saw seven golden Candlesticks, and seven Stars.* And therefore to hold proportion, the Epistles are directed to seven Angels, and to seven Churches.

And

And this is called a mystery, Revel. 1. 20. *The Mystery of the seven Stars.* &c. Now a mystery is a secret which comprehends more then is expressed; and therefore though but one Angel be expressed, yet the mystery implies all the Angels of that Church.

Thirdly, to signifie their unity in the Ministerial function, and joynt commission to attend upon the feeding and governing of one Church, with one common care, as it were with one hand and heart. And this is more fitly declared by the name of one Angel, then of many. We often finde the name of (one) Prophet or Priest to be put for the general body of the Ministry, or whole multitude of Prophets or Priests, in the Church of Israel or Judah, when the Spirit of God intendeth to reprove, threaten, or admonish them. Thus it is *Iere. 6. 13. 18. 19. Isa. 3. 2. Hof. 9. 8. Ezek. 7. 26. Hof. 4. 6. Mal. 2. 7.* Neither should it seem strange, that a multitude or company of Ministers should be understood under the name of one Angel, seeing a multitude of Heavenly Angels (employed in one service for the good of Gods Saints) is sometimes in the Scripture shut up under one Angel in the singular number, as may be gathered from *Gen. 14. 7. 2 Kings 19. 35. Psal 34. 7.* compared with *Psal 91. 11. Gen. 32. 1. 2. Kings 6. 16, 17.* And also a multitude of Devils or evil Angels, jointly labouring in any one work, is set forth under the name of one evil or unclean spirit, *1 Kings 22. 21, 22. Mark 1. 23, 24. Mark 5. 2. 9. Luke 4. 33. 34. Luk. 8. 27. 30. 1 Pet. 5. 8. Heb. 2. 14. Ephes. 6. 11. 12.*

But now let us suppose (which yet notwithstanding we will not grant) that the word *Angel* is taken individually for one particular person, as Doctor Reynolds seems to interpret it, together with Master Beza, yet nevertheless, there will nothing follow out of this acception, that will any ways make for the upholding of a Diocesan Bishop, with sole power of Ordination and Jurisdiction, as a distinct Superior to Presbyters. And this appears,

First, because it never was yet proved nor ever will (as we conceive) that these Angels were Diocesan Bishops, considering that Parishes were not divided into Diocesses in *S. Johns* days. And the seven Stars are said to be fixed in their seven Candlesticks or Churches, not one Star over divers Candlesticks. Neither can those Churches be thought to be Diocesan, when not onely *Tindal* and the old translation, calls them seven Congregations, but we read also *Acts 20.* that at *Ephesus* which was one of those Candlesticks, there was but one flock.

And secondly, we further finde that in *Ephesus* one of those seven Churches, there were many Presbyters, which are all called Bishops, *Acts 20. 28.* and we finde no colour of any superintendency or superiority of one Bishop over another. To them in general the Church is committed to be fed by them without any respect had to *Timothy*, who stood at his Elbow, and had been with him in Macedonia, and was now waiting

waiting upon him to Jerusalem. This is also confirmed by *Epiphanius* who writing of the Heresies of the *Miletians*, saith, that in ancient times this was peculiar to *Alexandria*, that it had but one Bishop, whereas other Cities had two. And he being Bishop of *Cypres*, might well be acquainted with the condition of the Churches of *Asia*, which were so nigh unto him.

Thirdly, there is nothing said in the seven Epistles that implyeth any superiority or majority of rule or power that these Angels had over the other Angels that were joyned with them in their Churches. It is written indeed, in commendation of the Angel of the Church of *Ephesus*, that he could not beare them that were evil, and that he had tryed them which say they were Apostles and are not, and had found them lyers. And it is spoken in dispraise of the Angel of *Pergamus*, that he suffered them which held the Doctrine of *Balaam*, &c. But these things are common duties requirable at the hands of all Ministers, who have the charge of souls.

But suppose that there were some superiority and preheminency insinuated by this individual Angel, yet who knoweth not that there are diverse kinds of superiority? to wit, of Order, of Dignity, of Gifts and Parts, or in degree of Ministry, or in charge of power and jurisdiction. And how will it be proved that this Angel if he had a superiority, had any more then a superiority of Order, or of Gifts and Parts? Where it is said, that this Angel was a superior degree or order of Ministry above Presbyters? In which Epistle is it said that this Angel had sole power of Ordination and Jurisdiction? And therefore as our learned Protestants prove against the Papists, that where Christ directed his speech to *Peter* in particular and said, *I will give unto thee the Keys of the kingdom of Heaven*; &c. That this particularization of *Peter* did not import any singular preheminence or majority of power to *Peter* more then to the other Apostles; But that though the promise was made to *Peter*, yet it was made to him in the name of all the rest, and given to all as well as one. And that therefore it was spoken to one person, and not to all; that so Christ might fore-signifie the unity of his Church, as * *Cyprian*, *Austin*, *Hierome*, *Optatus*, and others say. So when Christ directs an Epistle to one Angel, it doth not imply a superior power over his fellow-Angels, but at most only a prelidency for order sake. And that which is written to him, is written to the rest as well as to him. And therefore written to one, not to exclude the rest, but to denote the unity that ought to be between the Ministers of the same Church in their common care and diligence to their flock. And this is all that Doctor *Reynolds* saith, as you may read in his conference with *Hart*, cap. 4. divis. 3. ad finem. For it is evident that Doctor *Reynolds* was an utter enemy to the *Ius Divinum* of the Episcopal preheminency over Presbyters, by his Letter to Sir Francis

Hoc erant
tque &
eteri A-
stoli quod
erat Pe-
us, pari
n sortio
editi &
moris &
estatis,
exordi-
ab uni-
e profi-
itur, ut
lesia u-
mon-
tur.

Krolls. And learned Master Beza also saith something to the same purpose in his Annotations upon Revel. 2. 1. *Angelo. i. προεστῶτι quem nimirum oportuit imprimis de his rebus admoneri, ac per eum ceteros collegas totamque adeo Ecclesiam. Sed hinc statui Episcopalis ille gradus postea humanitus in Ecclesiam Dei inuectus certe nec potest nec debet, imo ne perpetuum quidem istud προεστῶτος munus esse necessario oportuisse, sicut exorta inde Tyrannis Oligarchica (cujus apex est Antichristiana bestia) certissima cum totius non Ecclesiæ modo, sed etiam orbis perniciæ, nunc tandem declarat.*

If therefore our Remonstrant can produce no better evidence for his Hierarchy then *Timothy* and *Titus*, and the *Angels of the Asian Churches*, Let not this Remonstrant and his party, cry out of wrong, if this claimed Hierarchy be for ever booted out of the church, seeing it is his owne Option. And yet we cannot conceale one refuge more out of Scripture, to which the Hierarchy betake themselves for shelter. And that is the two Postscripts in the end of Pauls second Epistle to *Timothy*, and of that to *Titus*; where in the one, *Timothy* is said to be the first Bishop of *Ephesus*, and in the other, *Titus* is said to be the first Bishop of the Church of the *Cretians*: to both which places wee answer.

That these two Postscripts (and so all the rest) are no part of Canonical Scripture. And therefore our former and ancienter English translations, though they have these Postscripts, yet they are put in a small character different from that of the Text. Although our Episcopal men of late in newer impressions have enlarged their Phylacteries, in putting those Postscripts in the same full character with that of the Text, that the simple might beleieve they are Canonical Scripture. The Papists themselves (*Baronius*, *Serrarius*, and the *Rhemists*) confesse that there is much falsity in them. The first Epistle to *Timothy*, is thus subscribed: *the first to Timothy was written from Laodicea, which is the chiefeſt City of Phrygia Pacatiana.* Here wee demand, whether *Paul* when hee writ the first Epistle to *Timothy*, was assured he should live to write a second, which was written long after? And if not; How comes it to bee subscribed, *the first to Timothy*, which hath relation to a second? Besides, the Epistle is said to bee writ from *Laodicea*, whereas *Beza* in his Annotations proves apparently, that it was written from *Macedonia*; to which Opinion *Baronius* and *Serrarius* subscribe. It is added, *Which is the chiefeſt City of Phrygia Pacatiana.* But this Epithet is nowhere read in the Writers of those ages, saith *Beza*, *Sed apud recentiores illo, qui Romani imperii jam inclinantis provincias descripserunt.* So that by this place it is evident, that the subscription was added a long while after the writing.

writing of the Epistles by some men, for the most part *vel indoctis*, saith Beza, *vel certe non satis attentis*, Either by a Learned, or negligent man.

The second Epistle is thus subscribed; *The second Epistle unto Timothy, ordained the first Bishop of the Church of the Ephesians, was written from Rome, when Paul was brought before Nero the second time.* Now these words *Ordained the first Bishop*, is wanting, saith Beza, in quibusdam vetustis codicibus, in veteri vulgata editione, & apud Syrum interpretem. If Saint Paul had written this Postscript, he would not have said, *To Timothy the first Bishop, &c.* whereas it was not yet certain whether ever there should bee a second. Neither would it bee said when Paul was brought, &c. But when I was the second time brought before Nero. The Syriack Interpreter reads it, *Here ends the second Epistle to Timothy written from Rome.*

The Epistle to Titus is thus subscribed: *Written to Titus, Ordained first Bishop of the Church of the Cretians, from Nicopolis of Macedonia.* Here it is said that this Epistle was written from *Nicopolis*, whereas it is cleare that Paul was not at *Nicopolis* when he wrote it. *Tit. 3. 12.* *Be diligent to come to me at Nicopolis, for I have determined there to winter.* Hee doth not say, *Here to winter*, but *There*; Where note, for the present he was not there. And besides it is said, that *Titus* was *Ordained the first Bishop, &c.* And who was the second? or was there ever a second? And also *He is said to be Bishop*, not onely of a Diocese, but of all Creet. Was there ever such a second Bishop? Adde, lastly, that it is said, *Bishop of the Church of the Cretians*; Whereas it would bee said of the *Churches of the Cretians*. For the Christian Churches of any Nation are called Churches by *Luke* and *Paul*, not Church. Therefore *Codex Claremontanus* subscribes; *Here ends the Epistle to Titus*, and no more. So the Syriack; *Finitur Epistola ad Titum quæ scripta fuit à Nicopoli.* The old Vulgar Edition hath nothing of the Episcopacy of *Titus*. By all this it appears, that if the Bishops had no more authority to urge us to subscribe to their Ceremonies; then they have authority for their Episcopal Dignity by these Subscriptions, there would be no more subscription to Ceremonies in the Churches of England.

But some will say, that there is one objection out of Scripture yet unanswered, and that is from the inequality that was betwene the twelve Apostles, and the seventy Disciples.

To which we answer;

First, that it cannot be proved that the twelve Apostles had any superiority over the seventy, either of Ordination, or Jurisdiction, or that there was any subordination of the seventy unto the twelve: but suppose it was, yet we answer

Secondly

Secondly, that a superiority and inferiority between Officers of different kinds, will not prove that there should be a superiority and inferiority between Officers of the same kind. No man will deny but that in Christs time, there were Apostles, Evangelists, Prophets, Pastors, and Teachers, and that the Apostles were superior to Evangelists and Pastors But it cannot be proved, that one Apostle had any superiority over another Apostle, or one Evangelist over another. And why then should one Presbyter be over another? Hence it followeth, that though we should grant a superiority between the twelve and the seventy, yet this will not prove the question in hand. Because the question is concerning Officers of the same kind, and the instance is of Officers of different kinds, amongst whom no man will deny but there may be a superiority and inferiority, as there is amongst us between Presbyters and Deacons.

And now let your *Honours* judge (considering the premisses) how far this Episcopal government is from any *Divine right*, or *Apostolical Institution*: And how true that speech of *Hierome* is, that a Bishop as it is a superiour Order to a Presbyter, is an *Humane presumption*, not a *Divine Ordinance*.

But though Scripture fails them, yet the indulgence and Munificence of *Religious Princes* may support them, and to this the *Remonstrant* makes his next recourse, yet so as he acknowledgeth here, *Engagements to Princes onely for their accessory dignities, titles, and Maintenance; not at all for their stations and functions*, (wherein yet the author plainly acknowledgeth a difference between our Bishops and the Bishops of old by such accessions.)

For our parts, we are so farre from envying the *gracious Munificence of pious Princes*, in collating honourable maintenance upon the *Ministers of Christ*, that we beleeve, that even by Gods own Ordinance, double Honour is due unto them.

And that by how much the *Ministry of the Gospell* is more honourable then that of the *Law*, by so much the more ought all that embrace the *Gospell*, to be carefull to provide, that the *Ministers of the Gospell* might not onely live, but maintain Hospitality, according to the Rule of the *Gospell*. And that worthy *Gentleman* spake as an Oracle, that said, *That scandalous Maintenance is a great cause of a scandalous Ministry*.

Yet we are not ignorant, that when the Ministry came to have *Agros, domos, locationes, vehicula, equos, latifundia*, as *Chrysostom*

1st. Hom. 86 in Matth. That then *Religio peperit divitias*, & *filia devoravit Matrem*, Religion brought forth riches, and the Daughter devoured the Mother; and then there was a voice of Angels heard from Heaven; *Hodie venenum in Ecclesiam Christi cecidit*. This day is poison shed into the Church of Christ.

And then it was that *Ierom* complained, *Christi Ecclesia postquam ad Christianos principes venit*, *potentiâ quidem & divitiis major*, *sed virtutibus minor facta est*. Then also was that Conjunction found true; That when they had wooden Chalice, they had golden Priests; but when their Chalice was golden, their Priests were wooden.

And though we do not think, there is any such impossibility, but that large Revenues may be happily managed with an humble sociableness, yet is very rare to finde History tells us, that the superfluous revenues of the Bishops not onely made them neglect their Ministry, but further ushered in their stately and pompous attendance; which did so elevate their spirits, that they insulted over their brethren, both Clergy and People, and gave occasion to others to hate and abhorre the Christian Faith, Which *Eusebius* sets forth fully in the pride of *Paulus Samosatenus*, vho notwithstanding the meanness and obscurity of his birth, afterwards grew to that height of insolency and pride in all his carriage, especially in that numerous traine that attended him in the streets, and in his stately throne raised after the manner of Kings and Princes; that *Fides nostra invidia*, & odio, propter fastam & superbiam cordis illius, facta fuerit obnoxia; The Christian Faith was exposed to envy and hatred through his pride.

*Euseb. lib. 7.
cap. 29.*

And as their ambition (sed vith the largeness of their revenues) discovered it self in great attendance, stately dwellings, and all Lordly pomp, so *Hierom* complains of their pride in their stately seates, *qui velut in aliqua sublimi specula constituti*, *vix dignantur videre mortales & alloqui conservos suos*: who sitting aloft as it were in a watch-tower, will scarce deigne to looke upon poore mortalls, or speake to their fellow-servants.

Here we might be large in multiplying several testimonies against the pride of Ecclesiasticall persons, that the largeness of their revenues rayed them to: but we will conclude with that grave complaint of *Sulpitius Severus*.

Ille qui antè pedibus aut asello ire consueverat, spumante equo superbus invehitur; parvâ prius ac vili cellula contentus habitare, erigit celsa Laquearia, construit multa conclavia, sculpsit postes, pingit a maria, vestitus

vestem respuit grossiorem, indumentum molle desiderat, &c. Which because the practice of our times hath already turned into English, we spare the labour to translate.

Onely suffer us (being now to give a *Vale* to our Remonstrants arguments) to recollect some few things.

First, whereas this Remonstrant saith; *If we do not shew out of the true & genuine writings of those holy men, that lived in the Apostles dayes a clear & received distinction of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, as three distinct subordinate callings, with an evident specification of the duty belonging to each of them: Let this claimed Hierarchy be for ever rooted out of the Church:* We beseech you, let it be remembred how we have proved out of the genuine and undeniable writings of the Apostles themselves, that these are not three distinct callings: *Bishops* are Presbyters, being with them all one, Name and Office, and that the distinction of Bishops and Presbyters was not of Divine Institution, but Humane: and that these Bishops, in their first Institution did not differ so much from Presbyters, as our present Bishops differ from them. Pag. 22.

Secondly, Whereas this Remonstrant saith, *If our Bishops challenge any other power then was by Apostolike authority delegated to, and required of Timothy and Titus, and the Angels of the Asian Churches: Let them be disclaimed as usurpers.* Wee desire it may be remembred, how we have proved first; that *Timothy* and *Titus* and the Angels who are Diocesan Bishops; and secondly, that our Bishops challenge (if not in their Polemickes, yet in their Practicks) a power that *Timothy* and *Titus*, and those Angels never did. Pag. 23.

Thirdly, Whereas this Remonstrant saith, *If there can be better evidence under Heaven for any matter of fact, let Episcopacy be for ever abandoned out of Gods Church:* We beseech you remember how weak we have discovered his Evidence to be; and then the Inference upon all these we humbly leave to your Honours Wisdom and Justice. Pag. 24.

SECT. XIV.

HAVING thus considered the validity of those arguments, whereby this Remonstrant would suffult *Episcopacy*, we descend now to inquire, what satisfaction he gives to those objections, which himself frames as the main; if not the sole arguments, that *Episcopacy* is assailable by, and they are two.

First, that pleading the Divine right of *Episcopacy* is to the prejudice of *Sovereignty*. Secondly, that it casts a dangerous imputation upon all those Reformed Churches that want this Government.

To the first, the prejudice of *Sovereignty*; he answers there is a compatibleness in this case of Gods *Act*, and the Kings: it is God that makes the Bishop, the King that gives the Bishoprick.

But we have proved already, that God never made a Bishop, as he stands in his *Superiority* over all other *Presbyters*, he never had Gods *Fiat*: and if they disclaim the influence of sovereignty unto their creation to a Priority, and assert that the King doth not make them *Bishops*, they must have no being at all. Sure we are, the Laws of the Land proclaim, that not only *Bishopricks*, but *Bishops* and all the *Jurisdiction* they have, is from the King: whereas the *Remonstrant* acknowledgeth no more, but the bare * place and exercise to be from *Regall donation*, which cannot be affirmed without apparent prejudice of that Sovereignty which the *Laws* of the Land have invested our Princes with.

37. Hen. 8.
cap. 17.

*The Remonstrant here acknowledges the same of the King, that Frier Simon a Florentine did of the Pope, who affirmed the degree of a Bishop was *de jure divino*, but every particular Bishop *de jure Pontificio*.
Hist. con. Trid.

Ag. 28, 29.

And for his unworthy comparison of *Kings* in order to *Bishops*, and *Patrons* in order to their *Clerkes*, when he shall prove that the *Patron* gives ministerial power to his *Clerke*, as the *King* according to our *Laws* gives *Episcopall* power to the *Bishop*, it may be of some conducement to his cause; but till then, we leave the unsuitnesse of this comparison, and the unthankfulness of those men to the indulgence of their Sovereigne, to their deserved recompence.

His learned answer to such men as borrowing Saint *Ieroms* phrase, speake Saint *Pauls* truth, is in summe this:

That he knowes not how to prescribe to mens thoughts, but for all his Rhetoricke, they will think what they list; but if they will grant him the question, they shall soon be at an end of the quarrell: which one answer if satisfactory, would silence all controversies to as good purpose as he did *Bellarmino*, who said, *Bellarmino* saith it is thus, and I say it is not, and where is *Bellarmino* now?

Ag. 29.

To the second objection, that *Episcopacie* thus asserted casts an imputation upon all the reformed Churches, that want that Government, he saith, that the objection is intended to raise envie against them, who (if they may be beleaved) love and honour those sister-Churches; and bless God for them.

But do they out pluck all this envie upon themselves, who in their Conferences, Writings, Pulpits, Universities, Disputes, High Commissions, Declamations, have disclaimed them as no Churches; that have

disclaimed the Prelates and have honoured the most glorious Lights of those Reformed Churches, Calvin, Beza, and others with no better titles then of Rascals, Blasphemers? &c.

But the pith of his answer after a few good words is this, that no such consequent can be drawn from their opinion; for their *Im divinum* pleads only for a *Iustificableness* of this holy calling: not for an absolute necessity of it, warranting it where it is, and requiring it where it may be had; but not fixing upon the Church that wants it, the defect of any thing of the Essence of a Church, but only of the glory and perfection of it; neither is it their sin, but their misery.

And is it so, doth not this *Im divinum* argue a *Necessitie*, but only a *Iustificableness* of this calling? nor is the want of it a want of any thing of Essence, but onely of perfection? we had thought, that page the 20th, where this *Remonstrant* strives to fetch the pedigree of *Episcopacie* from no lesse than *Apostolicall*, and in that right *Divine institution* he had reckoned it among those things, which the Apostles ordained for the succeeding administration of the Church in *essentiall matters*: but here it seemes he is willing to retract what there fell from him: there it was to his advantage to say, this Government was a thing essentiall to the Church, and here it is no lesse advantage to say, it is not essentiall.

But if it be not Essentiall, then what is the reason that when a Priest who hath received Orders at Rome, turnes to us, they urge not him to receive ordination among us again: but when some of our brethren, who flying in Queene *Maries* dayes, had received *Imposition of hands* in the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas, returned again in the dayes of Queene *Elizabeth*, they were urged to receive *Imposition of hands* againe from our Bishops, and some did receive it. If those Churches that want Bishops, want nothing essentiall to a Church; then what *Essentiall* want was there in the Ordination of those *Ministers* that received *Imposition of hands* in those Churches, that might deserve a *Re-ordination*, more than if they had first received their Ordination at Rome?

And what is the reason that Bishop *Mountague* so confidently affirms, that Ordination by *Episcopall hands* is so necessary, as that the Church is no true Church without it, and the Ministry no true Ministry, and ordinarily no salvation to be obtained without it? And if this *Remonstrant* should leave Bishop *Mountague* to answer for himself, yet notwithstanding he stands bound to give us satisfaction to these two questions, which arise from his own Book.

First,

*Originum re-
clatificatio
tent p[ro]p[ri]e
p[ro]p[ri]e p[ro]p[ri]e
453-464.*

First, whether *that Office*, which by *divine right* hath the *sole power of Ordaining*, and *Ruling* all other *Officers* in the Church, (as he saith *Episcopacie* hath) belong not to the being, but onely to the glory and perfection of a Church? Secondly, there being (in this mans thoughts) the same *Ius divinum* for Bishops, that there is for Pastors and Elders, whether if those *Reformed Churches* wanted Pastors and Elders too, they should want nothing of the *Essence* of a Church, but of the *perfection and glory* of it?

But this *Remonstrant* seemes to know so much of the minde of those Churches, that if they might have their option, they would most gladly embrace *Episcopall Government*, as little differing from their own *Moderatorship*, save onely in the perpetuities of it, and the new *Invention* (as he odiously calls it) of *lay-Elders*. But no question those learned Worthies that were intrusted by the Churches to compile their *Confessions*, did comprise their *Judgements* better than the *Composer* of this *Remonstrance*. And to his presumption, we oppose their *Confession*. We will begin with the *French Church*, who in their *Confession* speake thus:

'Credimus veram Ecclesiam gubernari debere eâ politia, quam Dominus noster Iesus Christus sancivit, ita videlicet, ut sint in ea Pastores, Presbyteri, sive Seniores, & Diaconi, ut doctrina puritas retineatur, &c. Art. 29. Credimus omnes Pastores ubicunque collocati sunt, eâdem & aequali potestate inter se esse praditos sub uno illo capite summoque & solo universali Episcopo Iesu Christo. Art. 30. Gallicæ Confessionis. Credimus veram hanc Ecclesiam debere regi, ac gubernari, spirituali illâ politia, quam nos Deus ipse in

We believe that the true Church ought to be governed by that policy which Christ Jesus our Lord established, viz. that there be Pastors, Presbyters, or Elders, and Deacons. And again, We believe that all true Pastors whereever they be, are endued with equal and the same power, under one chief Head and Bishop Christ Jesus. Consonant to this the *Dutch Churches*: We believe (say they) the true Church ought to be ruled with that spiritual policy which God hath taught us
in

verbo suo edocuit; ita ut sint in ea Pastores ac Ministri, qui purè & concionentur, & Sacramenta administrent; sint quoque Seniores & Diaconi, qui Ecclesia Sematum constituent, ut his veluti mediis vera Religio conservari, Hominesque vitiis dediti spiritualiter corripi & emendari possint. Tunc enim ritè & ordinatè omnia sunt in Ecclesia, cum viri fideles, & pii ad ejus gubernationem deliguntur juxta Divi Pauli præscriptum, 1 Tim. 3. Confes. Belgic. Art. 30. Caterùm ubicunque locorum sunt verbi Dei Ministri, eandem atque aequalem Omnes habent tum Potestatem tum Authoritatem, ut qui sunt aequè Omnes Christi unici illius universalis Episcopi & capit is Ecclesie Ministri.

In which Harmony of these Confessions, see how both Churches agree in these five points :

First, That there is in the Word of God, an exact form of Government set down; *Deus in verbo suo edocuit.*

Secondly, That this form of Government Christ established in his Church; *Jesus Christus in Ecclesia sancivit.*

Thirdly, That this form of Government is by Pastors, Elders, and Deacons.

Fourthly, That the true Church of Christ ought to be thus governed; *Veram Ecclesiam debere regi.*

Fifthly, That all true Ministers of the Gospel are of equal power and authority.

For the reason he assigns, why those Churches should make this Option, we cannot enough admire that such a passage should fall from his pen, as to say, There is little difference between their *procuracia*, and our *Episcopacy*, save onely in perpetuity and lay-Elders; for who knows not that between these two there is a vast a difference

in his Word, to wit, that there be in it Pastors to preach the Word purely, Elders and Deacons to constitute the Ecclesiastical Senate, that by these means Religion may be preserved, and manners corrected. And so again, We believe wherever the Ministers of God are placed, they *All* have the same equal Power and Authority, as being *All* equally the Ministers of Christ.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

as between the *Duke of Venice* and an *absolute Monarch*. For, 1, the Moderator in *Geneva* is not of a superiour order to his Brethren; nor 2, hath an Ordination differing from them; nor 3, assumes power of sole Ordination or Jurisdiction; nor hath he 4, maintenance for that Office above his Brethren; nor 5, a Negative voice in what is agreed by the rest; nor 6, any further power than any of his Brethren. So that the difference between our Bishops and their Moderators is more then *Little*: But if it be so little as this *Remonstrant* here pretends; then the *Alteration* and *Abrogation* of *Episcopacy* will be with the lesse difficulty, and occasion the less disturbance.

SECT. XV.

BUT there is another thing, wherein our *Episcopacy* differs from the *Geneva Moderatorship*, besides the perpetuity; and that is the exclusion of the *Lay-Presbytery*, which (if we may believe this *Remonstrant*) never till this age had footing in the *Christian Church*.

In which assertion, this *Remonstrant* concludes so fully, with *Bishop Halls Irrefragable Propositions*, and his other Book of *Episcopacie by Divine right*, as if he had conspired to swear to what the Bishop had said.

Now, though we will not enter the Lists with a man of that Learning and fame, that Bishop Hall is, yet we dare tell this *Remonstrant*, that this his assertion hath no more truth in it, then the rest that we have already noted. We will (to avoid prolixity) not urge those * three known Texts of Scripture, produced by some for the establishing of Governing Elders in the Church, not yet vindicated by the Adversaries,

Nor will we urge that famous Text of * *Ambrose* in 1 Tim. 5.

But if there were no *Lay-Elders* in the Church till this present age, we would be glad to learn, who they were of whom *Origen* speaks, when he tells us, it was the Custome of Christian Teachers, first to examine such as desired to heare them, of whom there were two orders; the first were *Catechumeni*, or beginners; the other was of such as were more perfect: among whom *ἱσὶ τινες τεταγμένοι πρὸς τὸ φιλοσοφῆν τοῖς βίαις καὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς τῶν προσβύτων*, &c. Nonnulli prepositi sunt qui in vitam & mores eorum qui admittuntur inquirant, ut qui turpia committant eos communi Catæ interdican- qui vero ab istis abhorrent, ex anima complexi, meliores quotidie reddant:

There

* 1 Tim. 5. 17.

1 Cor. 12. 28.

Rom. 12. 8.

* Unde & Sy-

nagoga, & po-

lea Ecclesia

seniores habuit,

quorum sine

Consilio nihil

agebatur in Ec-

clesia. Quod quā

negligentiā ob-

solverit nescio,

nisi forte Do-

ctorum desidia,

aut magis super-

bia, dum soli

volunt aliquid

videri.

Origen. Lib. 3.

contra Celsum.

There are some ordained to inquire into the life and manners of such as are admitted into the Church, that they may banish such from the publique Assembly, that perpetrate scandalous Acts; which place tells us plainly :

First, that there were some in the higher forme of hearers (not Teachers) who were *Censores morum* over the rest. Secondly, that they were designed or constituted to this work, *τελεωματα*. Thirdly, that they had such Authority intrusted into their hands, as that they might interdict such as were scandalous from the publique Assemblies. We would gladly know, whether these were not, as it were, *Lay-Elders*?

That there were such in the Church (distinguished from others that were called to teach) appears. *Augustine* writing to his Charge, directs his Epistle, *Dilectissimis fratribus, Clero, Senioribus, & universa Plebi Ecclesie Hipponensis*: where first there is the general compellation, *Fratribus, Brethren*; Then there is a distribution of these Brethren into the Clergie, the Elders, and the whole People; so that there were in that Church Elders distinguished both from the Clergie, and the rest of the People.

So again, *Contra Cresconium Grammaticum*: *Omnes vos Episcopi, Presbyteri, Diaconi, and Seniores scitis*; All you Bishops, Elders, Deacons, and Elders do know. What were those two sorts of Elders there mentioned in one comma, and *ibidem* cap. 56. *Peregrinus Presbyter & Seniores Ecclesie Musticana Regionis tale desiderium prosequuntur*; where again we read of Elder and Elders, Presbyter, and Seniors in one Church.

Both those passages are upon record in the publick acts, which are more fully set down by *Baronius*, Anno 303. Num. 15, 16, 17. As also by *Albaspinus*, in his Edition of *Opratus*: in which Acts the Seniors are often mentioned. In that famous relation of the purging of *Cacilianus* and *Felix*, there is a copie of a Letter; *Fratribus & filiis: Clero & Senioribus, Fratribus in Domino aternam salutem*: Another Letter is mentioned a little before, *Clericis & Senioribus Cirthenisum in Domino aternam Salutem*. These Seniors were interested in affaires concerning the Church as being the men, by whose advice they were managed.

The Letter of *Purpurius* to *Silvanus* saith, *Aabibete concletricos, & seniores plebis, Ecclesiasticos Viros, & inquirant que sit iste Dissensio: ut ea que sunt secundum fidei Precepta sunt*, Where we see the joynt power of these Seniors, with the Clergie in ordering Eccle-

fiastical affairs; that by their wisdom and care peace might be settled in the Church; for which cause, these *Seniors* are called *Ecclesiastical men*; and yet they are distinguished from *Clergie men*.

They are mentioned again afterwards by *Maximus*, saying, *Loquor nomine SENIORUM Populi Christiani*. *Greg. Mag.* distinguisheth them also from the *Clergie*: *Tabellarium cum consensu SENIORUM & Cleri meminere Ordinandum*.

Aug. Serm.
19. de Verb.
Dom.

These *Seniors* had power to reprove offenders, otherwise why should *Augustine* say, *Cum ob errorem aliquem à Senioribus arguuntur, & impunitur alicui cur abrim fuerit, cur res alienas pervaserit, &c.* when they were by the *Elders* reprov'd for their errors, and drunkenness is laid to a mans charge, &c. So that it was proper to the *Seniors* to have the cognizance of *Delinquents*, and to reprove them.

August. in
Psal. 38.
Conc. 2.

The same *Augustine* in *Psal. 36*. *Necesse nos fuerat Primiani causam, quem, &c. Seniorum literis ejusdem Ecclesie postulantibus audire*. Being requested by Letters from the *Seniors* of that Church, it was needful for me to hear the cause of *Primian*, &c.

So again, *Optatus*, who mentioning a persecution that did for a while scatter the Church, saith, *Erant Ecclesia ex auro & argento quam plurima Ornamenta, qua nec defodere terra, nec secum portare poterat, quare fidelibus Senioribus commendavit Albaspineus*, that learned Antiquary, on that place acknowledges, that *Besides the Clergie there were certain of the Elders of the people, men of approved life, that did tend the affairs of the Church, of whom this place is to be understood*.

By all these testimonies it is apparent; first, that in the ancient Church there were some called *Seniors*. Secondly, that these *Seniors* were not *Clergie men*. Thirdly, that they had a stroke in governing the Church, and managing the affairs thereof. Fourthly, that *Seniors* were distinguished from the rest of the people.

Pag. 32.

Neither would we desire to chuse any other Judges in this whole controversy; then whom himself constituted; Forreign Divines, taking the general Suffrage and practice of the Churches, and not of particular men.

As for the learned *Spanhemius* whom he produceth, though we give him the deserved honour of a worthy man: yet we think it too much to speak of him, as if the judgment of the whole Church of Geneva were incorporated into him, as this Remonstrant doth. And for *Spanhemius* himselfe, we may truly say, in the place cited,

he delivered a complement, rather then his judgement, which in *Dedicatorie Epistles* is not unusuall. We know that reverend *Calvins* and learned *Beza* have said as much upon occasion in their *Epistles*, and yet the Christian world knowes their Judgement was to the contrary

Little reason therefore hath this Remonstrant, to declaime against all such as speake against this Government as unlawfull, with the termes of *Ignorance* and *spitefull Sectaries*, because they call the Government unlawfull: had they proceeded further to call it Antichristian, (which he charges upon them) they had said no more, then what our eares have heard some of their principall Agents, their *Legati à Latere* speake publickly in their visitations: That however the Church of England be as sound, and Orthodox in her Doctrine as any Church in the World yet in our Discipline and Government we are the same with the Church of Rome, which amounts to as much as to say the Government is Antichristian, unless they will say, the Government of Rome is not so, nor the Pope Antichrist.

Pag. 33

Pag. 33.

Doct. Duck.

SECT. XVI.

NOW our Remonstrant begins to leave his dispute for the Office, and flowes into the large praises of the Persons, and what is wanting in his Arguments for the Place, thinks to make up in his *Encomiasticks* of the Persons, that have possesst that place in the Church of God: and tells us, that the Religious Bishops of all times are and have been they that have strongly upheld the truth of God against Satan and his Antichrist. It is well he sets this crown only upon the heads of Religious Bishops, as knowing that there are and have been some Irreligious ones, that have as strongly upheld Satan and his Antichrist against the truth of God. But the Religious Bishops are they that have all times upheld the truth. What? they? and onely they? did never any uphold the truth, but a Religious Bishop? did never any Religious Minister or Professor preach, or write, or die, to uphold the truth, but a Religious Bishop? if so, then there is some perswasive strength in that he saith; and a credulous man might be induced to think, *If Bishops go down, truth will go down too.* But if we can produce for one Bishop many others that have been valiant for the truth, this Rhetoricall insinuation will contribute no great help to their establishment. Nor indeed any at

Pag. 34

Pag. 35.

* We may rather think that they would have done more. Remem- bring what *Martinus* was wont to say to his friend *Sulpitius*, *Nequaquam sibi in Episcopatu eam virtutum Grati- am suppetisse, quam pius, se habuisse memi- nisset.* *Sulpitius Severus Dial. 2.*

Pag. 35.

Pag. 35.

Pag. 35.

unlesse he were able to make this good of *our times*, as well as of all others, which he assaies; for saith he, *Even amongst our own how many of the reverend & learned Fathers of the Church now living, have spent their spirits, & worne out their lives in the powerfull opposition of that man of sin?* how many? I Sir, we would fain know how many: that there are *some* that have stood up to beare witnesse against that *Man of sin*, we acknowledge with all due respect, to the Learning and worth of their Persons. But that their Episcopall dignity hath added either any *flame to their zeal*, or any *Nerves to their ability*, we cannot believe, nor can we think they would have done lesse in that cause, though they had beene no Bishops.

But what if this be true of some Bishops in the Kingdome, is it true of all? are there not some that have spent their spirits in the opposition of *Christ*, as others have in the opposition of *Antichrist*? and are there none but *Zealous, Religious Prelates* in the Kingdom? are there none upon whom the guilt of that may meritoriously be charged, which others have convincingly and meritoriously opposed? And are there not some Bishops in the Kingdome, that are so far from opposing the *Man of sin*, that even this *Remonstrant* is in danger of suffering under the name of *Puritan* for daring to call him by that name? we doubt not but this *Remonstrant* knowes there are.

But if he will against the light of his own Conscience, beare up a known error out of private respects, (we will not say these papers) but his own Conscience, shall one day be an evidence against him before the dreadfull Tribunal of the Almighty.

But there is yet a second thing that should endeare *Episcopacie*, and that is the careful, peaceable, painfull, conscionable manning of their Charges; to the great glory of God, and the comfort of his faithfull people. Which (in not seeming to urge) he urgeth to the full and beyond. This care, conscience, paines of our Bishops, is exercised and evidenced, either in their Preaching, or in their Ruling; for their Preaching, it is true, some few there are that *Labour in the Word and Doctrine*; whose persons in that respect we Honour: but the most are so far from Preaching, that they rather discourage, oppose, blaspheme Preaching.

It was a *Non-preaching Bishop*, that said of a *Preaching Bishop*, He was a *Preaching Coxcomb*. As for the discharge of their office of ruling, their entrusting their *Chancellors*, and other Officers with their visitations, and Courts (as ordinarily they do, whiles themselves attend the Court) doth abundantly witnesse their care in it.

The

The many and loud cries of the intolerable oppressions and tyrannies of their Court-proceedings; witnesse their peaceablenesse, their unjust fees, exactions, commutations; witnesse their conscionablenesse in managing their Charges, to the great glory of God, and the comfort of his faithfull people.

And hence it is that so many at this day hear ill; (how deservedly, saith this Remonstrant, God knows;) and do not your Honours know, and doth not this Remonstrant know? and doth not all the Nation (that will know any thing) know how deservedly *Some*, nay, *Most*, nay, *All the Bishops of this Nation* hear ill, were it but onely for the late Canons and Oath? *But why should the faults of some, diffuse the blame to all?* Why? by your owne argument, that would extend the deserts of some, to the patronage of *All*; and if it be a fault in the impetuous and undistinguishing *Vulgar*, so to involve all, as to make *Innocency* it self a sin; what is it in a Man able to distinguish, by the same implication, to shrowd sinne under *Innocencie*, the sin of many under the *Innocency* of a few?

But have our Bishops indeed beene so carefull, painfull, conscionable, in managing their Charges? how is it then that there are such manifold scandals of the inferiour Clergy presented to your Honours view, which he cannot mention without a bleeding heart; and yet could finde in his heart (if he knew how) to excuse them? and though he confesse them to be the shame and misery of our Church, yet is he not ashamed to plead their cause at your Honours BARRE, *Onuphrius*-like, that was the Advocate of every bad cause; and to excite you by *Constantines* example (in a different Cause alleadged) if not to suffer those Crimes, which himselfe calls hatefull, to passe unpunished, yet not to bring them to that open and publique punishment they have deserved.

But what, if pious *Constantine* (in his tender care to prevent the Divisions that the emulation of the Bishops of that age, enraged with a spirit of envie and faction, were kindling in the Church, lest by that meanes the Christian Faith should be derided among the Heathens) did suppress their mutuall accusations, many of which might be but upon surmises; and that not in a Court of Justice, but in an Ecclesiasticall Synode; shall this be urged before the highest Court of Justice upon earth, to the patronizing of Notorious scandals, and hatefull enormities, that are already proved by evidence of cleare witnesse?

But oh forbid it to tell it in Cath, &c. What, the sin? alas, that is done

done already; Do we not know, the drunkenesse, profanenesse, superstition, Popishnesse of the English Clergie rings at Rome already? yes undoubtedly; and there is no way to vindicate the Honour of our *Nation, Ministry, Parliaments, Sovereigne, Religion, God*; but by causing the punishment to ring as farre as the sin hath done; that our adversaries that have triumphed in their sin, may be confounded at their punishments. Do not your *Honours* know, that the plaistring or palliating of these rotten members, will be a greater dishonour to the Nation and Church, then their cutting off; and that the personall acts of these *sonnes of Belial*, being con-nived at, become Nationall sins?

But for this one fact of *Constantine*, we humbly crave your *Honours* leave to present to your wisdoms three Texts of Scripture, *Ezek 44.12.13. Because they ministred unto them before their idols, and caused the house of Israel to fall into iniquity, therefore have I lift up my hand unto them, saith the Lord, and they shall beare their iniquity. And they shall not come neere unto me, to do the Office of a Priest unto me, nor to come neere unto any of mine holy things in the most holy place, &c.*

The second is *Jerem. 48.10. Cursed be he that doth the work of the Lord negligently*; and the third is, *Judges 6.31. He that will plead for Baal, let him be put to death while it is yet morning*. We have no more to say in this; whether it be best to walk after the *President of Man*, or the *Prescript of God*, your *Honours* can easily judge.

SECT. XVII.

Page 39.

* In his Preface to his Book called, *The way to the True Church. Solinus.*

But stay, saith this *Remonstrant*; and indeed he might well have stayed and spared the labour of his ensuing discourse, about the Church of England, the *Prelaticall* and the *Antiprelaticall* Church: but these *Episcopall* Men deale as the *Papists*; that dazle the eyes, and astonish the senses of poor people, with the glorious name of the Church, the Church; The holy Mother the Church. This is the *Gorgons head*, as Doctor* *White* saith, that hath enchanted them, & held them in bondage to their Errors: All their speech is of the Church, the Church; no mention of the *Scriptures, of God the Father*; but all of the *Mother the Church*. Much like as they write of certain *Ethiopians*, that by reason they use no marriage, but promiscuously company together, the children only follow the *Mother*; the *Father* and his name is in no request, but the mother hath all the reputation

putation. So is it with the Author of this *Remonstrance*, he styles himself, a *Dutifull Son of the Church*. And it hath beene a Custom of late times to cry up the holy *Mother the Church of England*, to call for absolute obedience to *holy Church*; full conformity to the orders of *holy Church*; Neglecting in the meane time *God the Father, and the holy Scripture*.

But if we should now demand of them, what they meane by the *Church of England*? this *Author* seemes to be thunder-stricken at this Question; and calls the very *Question*, a *new Divinity*; where he deales like such as holding great revenues by unjust Titles, will not suffer their Titles to be called in Question.

Page 39.

For it is apparent, *Ac si solaribus radiis descriptum esset* (to use *Tertullians* phrase) that the word *Church* is an *Equivocall word*, and hath as many severall acceptions as letters; and that *Dolus latet in universalibus*. And that by the *Church of England*; first by some of these men is meant onely the *Bishops*; or rather the two *Archbishops*; or more properly the *Archbishop of Canterbury*: Just as the *Jesuited Papists* resolve the *Church* and all the glorious Titles of it into the *Pope*; so do these into the *Archbishop*, or at fullest, they understand it of the *Bishops and their party met in Convocation*; as the more ingenuous of the *Papists* make the *Pope and his Cardinals* to be their *Church*: thus excluding all the *Christian people and Presbyters of the Kingdome*; as not worthy to be reckoned in the number of the *Church*.

And which is more strange, this *Author* in his *Simplicity* (as he truly saith) *never heard, nor thought of any more Churches of England then one*; and what then shall become of his *Diocesan Churches*, and *Diocesan Bishops*? And what shall we think of *England*, when it was an *Heptarchy*? had it not then seven Churches, when seven Kings? Or if the *Bounds of a Kingdome* must constitute the *Limits and Bounds of a Church*, why are not *England, Scotland, and Ireland*, all one *Church*? when they are happily united under one *gracious Monarch*, into one *Kingdom*? We read in *Scripture*, of the Churches of *Judea*, and the Churches of *Galatia*; and why not the Churches of *England*? not that we denie the *Consociation or Combination* of Churches into a *Provinciall or Nationall Synod* for the right ordering of them. But that there should be no *Church in England*, but a *Nationall Church*: this is that which this *Author* in his *simplicity* affirmes, of which the very rehearfall is a refutation.

Seet.

SECT. XVIII.

There are yet two things with which this *Remonstrance* shuts up it self, which must not be past without our Obelisks.

First, he scoffs at the *Antiprelatical Church*, and the *Antiprelatical Divisions*; for our parts, we acknowledge no *Antiprelatical Church*. But there are a company of men in the *Kingdom*, of no mean rank or quality, for *Piety, Nobility, Learning*, that stand up to bear witness against the *Hierarchie* (as it now stands:) their usurpations over Gods Church and Ministers, their cruel using of Gods people by their tyrannical government: this we acknowledge; and if he call these the *Antiprelatical Church*, we doubt not but your Honours will consider, that there are many thousands in this Kingdom, and those pious and worthy persons, that thus do, and upon most just cause.

It was a speech of *Erasmus* of *Luther*, *Ut quisque vir est optimus, ita illius Scriptis minime offendi*; The better any man was, the less offence he took at *Luthers* Writings: but we may say the contrary of the Prelates, *Ut quisque vir est optimus, ita illorum factis magis offendi*; The better any man is, the more he is offended at their dealings. And all that can be objected against this party, will be like that in *Tertullian*. *Bonus vir Cajus Sejus, sed malus tantum, quia Antiprelaticus*. But he upbraids us with our *Divisions & Subdivisions*, so do the Papists upbraid the Protestants with their *Lutheranisme, Calvinisme, and Zuinglianisme*. And this is that the Heathens objected to the Christians, their *Fractures* were so many, they knew not which Religion to chuse if they should turn Christians: And can it be expected that the Church in any age should be free from Divisions, when the times of the Apostles were not free? and the Apostle tells us, *It must needs be that there be divisions*: in *Greg. Naz.* dayes there were 600 Errors in the Church; do these any wayes derogate from the truth and worth of Christian Religion?

But as for the Divisions of the Antiprelatical party, so odiously exaggerated by this Remonstrant: Let us assure your Honours, they have been much fomented by the Prelates, whose practice hath been according to that rule of *Machiavil*: *Divide & Impera*, and they have made these divisions, & afterwards complain'd of that which their Tyranny and Policy hath made. It is no wonder, considering the paths our Prelates have trod, that there are Divisions in the Nation. The wonder is our divisions are no more.

Tertull. adversus Gent.

no greater; and we doubt not but if they were of that gracious spirit, and so intirely affected to the peace of the Church as *Greg. Naz.* was, they would say as he did in the tumults of the people, *Mitte nos in mare, & non erit tempestas*; rather then they would hinder that sweet *Concordance*, and conspiracy of minde unto a Government that shall be every way agreeable to the rule of Gods Word, and profitable for the edification and flourishing of the Church.

A second thing we cannot but take notice of, is the pains this *Author* takes to advance his *Prelaticall Church*: and forgetting what he had said in the beginning: *that this party was so numerous*, it could not be summed; tells us now, *these severall thousands are punctually calculated*. But we doubt not but your Honours will consider that there may be *multi homines, & pauci viri*; and that there are more against them then for them. Pag. 2.
Pag. 41.

And whereas they pretend, that they differ from us onely in a Ceremony or an Organ-pipe, (which however is no contemptible difference) yet it will appeare that our differences are in point of a superiour Alloy. Though this Remonstrant braves it in his multiplied Queries *What are the bounds of this Church? what the distinction of the professors and Religion? what grounds of faith? what new Creed do they hold different from their Neighbours? what Scriptures? what Baptisme? what meanes of Salvation other then the rest? yet if he pleased he might have silenced his owne Queries*: but if he will needs put us to the answer, we will resolve them one by one. Pag. 41.

First, if he ask what are the bounds of this Church? we answer him out of the sixt of their late founded Canons: where we finde the limits of this Prelatical Church extend as farre as from the high & lofty Promontory of Archbishops, to the *Terra incognita* of an, &c.

If what *Distinction of professors and Religion*; we answer, their worshipping towards the East, and bowing towards the Altar prostrating themselves in their approaches into Churches, placing all Religion in outward formalities, are visible differences of these professors and their Religion

If what *new Creed* they have, or what grounds of Faith differing from their Neighbours? we answer, Episcopacy by divine right is the first Article of their Creed, Absolute and blinde obedience to all the Commandements of the Church (that is, the Bishop and his Emissaries) election upon faith foreseen, the influence of works into *Justification*, falling from grace, &c.

If what *Scriptures* we answer, the Apocrypha and unwritten Traditions.

If what Baptism? a Baptism of absolute Necessity unto salvation; and yet insufficient unto salvation: as not sealing grace to the taking away of sinne after Baptisme.

If what Eucharist? an Eucharist that must be administred upon an Altar or a Table set Altar-wise, railed in an Eucharist, in which there is such a presence of Christ, (though *Modum nesciunt*) as makes the place of its Administration the throne of God, the place of the Residence of the Almighty; and impresseth such a holinesse upon it as makes it not only capable, but worthy of Adoration.

If what Christ? a Christ who hath given the same power of absolution to a Priest that himselfe hath.

If what Heaven? a Heaven that hath a broad way leading thither, and is receptive of Drunkards, Swearers, Adulterers, &c. such a heaven as we may say of it, as the Indians said of the heaven of the Spaniards: Unto that heaven which some of the Prelaticall Church living and dying in their scandalous sinnes, and hatefull enormities go to, let our soules never enter.

If what meanes of Salvation? we answer, confession of sinnes to a Priest, as the most absolute, undoubted, necessary, infallible meanes of Salvation.

Pag. 41.

Farre be it from us to say with this *Remonstrant*, We do fully agree in all these and all other Doctrinall, and practicall points of Religion, and preach one and the same saving truths. Nay, we must rather say as that holy Martyr did, *We thank God we are none of you.*

Pag. 42.

Nor do we because of this dissension feare the censure of uncharitableness from any but uncharitable men. But it is no usuall thing with the Prelates and their party, to charge such as protest against their corrupt opinions and wayes, with uncharitableness and Schisme, as the Papists do the Protestants: and as the Protestants do justly recriminate, and charge that Schisme upon the Papists, which they object to us; So may we upon the Prelates: And if *Austin* may be judge, the Prelates are more Schismaticks then we. *Quicumque* (saith he) *invident bonis, ut quarant occasiones excludendi eos, aut degradandi, vel crimina sua sic defendere parati sunt (si objecta vel predica fuerint) ut etiam conventicularum congregationes vel Ecclesie perturbaciones cogitent excitare, jam schismatici sunt.* Whosoever envie those that are good, and seeke occasions to exclude and degrade them, and are so ready to defend their faults, that rather then they will leave them, they will devise how to raise up troubles in the Church, and drive men into conventicles and corners, they are the Schismaticks.

And that all the world may take notice what just cause we have

to complain of Episcopacie, as it now stands, we humbly crave leave to propound these *Queries*.

Queries about Episcopacie,

WHether it be tolerable in a Christian Church, that Lord Bishops should be held to be *Jure Divino*; And yet the Lords day by the some men to be but *Jure Humano*? And that the same persons should cry up *Altars* in stead of *Communion-Tables*, and *Priests* in stead of *Ministers*, and yet not *Judaize*, when they will not suffer the Lords Day to be called the Sabbath-day, for feare of *Judaizing*? Whereas the word *Sabbath* is a generall word, signifying a day of rest, which is common as well to the Christian Sabbath, as to the Jewish Sabbath, and was also used by the Ancients, *Ruffinus in Psal. 47. Origen. Hom. 23. in Num. Gregory Nazian.*

Whether that assertion, No Bishop, No King; and no Ceremonie, no Bishop; be not very prejudiciall to Kingly Authority? For it seemes to imply, that the Civill power depends upon the Spiritual, and is supported by Ceremonies and Bishops.

Whether seeing it hath been proved, that Bishops (as they are novv asserted) are a meere humane Ordinance, it may not by the same Authority be abrogated, by vvhich it vvas first established; especially, considering the long experience of the hurt they have done to Church and State?

Whether the advancing of Episcopacie into *Jus Divinum*, doth not make it a thing simply unlayvfull to submit to that Government? Because that many consciencious men that have hitherto conformed to Ceremonies and Episcopacy, have done it upon this ground, as supposing that Authority did not make them matters of vvorship, but of Order and Decencie, &c. And thus they satisfied their consciences in answering those Texts, *Colos. 2. 20, 21, 22. Matth. 15. 9.* But novv since Episcopacy comes to be challenged as a Divine Ordinance, howv shall vve be responsible to those Texts? And is it not, as it is novv asserted, become an Idoll, and like the Brazen Serpent to be ground to povvder?

Whether there be any difference in the point of Episcopacy betweene *Jus Divinum* and *Jus Apostolicum*? Because we finde some claiming their standing by *Jus Divinum*; others by *Jus Apostolicum*. But we conceive that *Jus Apostolicum* properly taken, is all one with *Jus Divinum*. For *Jus Apostolicum* is such a *Jus*, which is founded upon the Acts and Epistles of the Apostles, written by them so as to be a perpetuall Rule for the succeeding Administration of the Church, as this Author saith, *Pag. 20.* And this *Jus* is *Jus Divinum*, as well as *Apostolicum*. But if by *Jus Apostolicum* they mean improp-

perly (as some do) such things which are not recorded in the Writings of the Apostles, but introduced, the Apostles being living, they cannot be rightly said to be *Jure Apostolico*, nor such things which the Apostles did intend the Churches should be bound unto. Neither is Episcopacie as it imports a superiority of power over a Presbyter, no not in this sense *Jure Apostolico*, as hath been already proved, and might further be manifested by divers Testimonies, if need did require. We will only instance in *Cassander* a man famous for his immoderate moderation in controverted Points of Religion, who in his *Consulat. Articuli*. 14. hath this saying, *An Episcopatus inter ordines Ecclesiasticos ponendus sit, inter Theologos & Canonistas non convenit? Convenit autem inter omnes, Apostolorum aetate inter Presbyterum & Episcopum nullum discrimen fuisse, &c.*

6

Whether the distinction of *Beza*, between *Episcopus Divinus*, *Humane*, & *Diabolicus*, be not worthy your Honours consideration? By the Divine Bishop, he means the Bishop as he is taken in Scripture, which is one and the same with a Presbyter. By the humane Bishop he means the Bishop chosen by the Presbyters to be President over them, and to rule with them by fixed Lawes and Canons. By the Diabolical Bishop, he means a Bishop with sole power of Ordination and Jurisdiction, Lording it over Gods heritage, and governing by his owne will and authority. Which puts us in minde of the Painter that Limned two pictures to the same proportion and figure; The one he reserved in secret, the other he exposed to common view. And as the phansie of beholders led them to censure any line or proportion, as not done to the life, he mends it after direction: If any fault be found with the eye, hand, foot, &c. He corrects it, till at last the addition of every mans fancy had defaced the first figure, and made that which was the Picture of a man, swell into a monster: Then bringing forth this and his other Picture which hee had reserved, he presented both to the people. And they abhorring the former, and applauding the latter, he cried, *Hunc populus fecit*: This deformed one the People made: This lovely one I made. As the Painter of his Painting, so (in *Beza's* sense) it may be said of Bishops, God at first instituted Bishops, such as are all one with Presbyters; and such are amiable, honourable in all the Churches of God. But when men would be adding to Gods institution, what power, preheminance, Jurisdiction, Lordlines their phansie suggested unto them, this divine Bishop lost his Original beauty, and became to be *Humanus*. And in conclusion (by these and other additions swelling into a Pope) *Diabolicus*.

*Hunc populus
fecit.*

7

Whether the Ancient Fathers, when they call *Peter* *Mark*,
James,

James, Timothy, and Titus Bishops, did not speak according to the Language of the times wherein they lived, rather then according to the true acception of the word Bishop? and whether it be not true which is here said in this Book, that they are called Bishops of *Alexandria, Ephesus, Hierusalem, &c.* in a very improper sense, because they abode at those places a longer time then at other places? For sure it is, if Christ made *Peter* and *James* Apostles (which are Bishops over the whole world) and the Apostles made *Marke, Timothy* and *Titus* Evangelists, &c. it seemes to us that it would have been a great sin in them to limit themselves to one particular Diocese, and to leave that calling in which Christ had placed them.

Whether Presbyters in Scripture are called *πρεσβύτεροι* & *ποιμένες*, and that it is an office, required at their hands, to rule and to govern, as hath bin proved in this Book; The Bishops can without sin arrogate the exercise of this power to themselves alone, and why they may not with the same lawfulness, impropriate to themselves alone the Key of Doctrine (which yet notwithstanding al would condemn) as well as the Key of Discipline, seeing that the whole power of the Keys is given to Presbyters in Scripture as well as to Bishops; as appears, *Mat. 16. 19.* where the power of the Keys is promised to *Peter*, in the name of the rest of the Apostles, and their successors; & given to all the Apostles, and their successors, *Mat. 18. 19. John. 20. 23.* And that Presbyters succeed the Apostles, appears not onely, *Mat. 28. 20.* but also, *Acts. 20. 28.* where the Apostle ready to leave the Church of *Ephesus* commends the care of ruling and feeding it to the Elders of that Church. To this *Irenaeus* witnesseth, *lib 4 cap. 43. 44.* This Bishop *Jewell* against *Harding*, *Artic. 4 Sect. 5, 6.* saith, that all Pastors have equall power of binding and loosing with *Peter*.

Whether since that Bishops assume to themselves power temporall (to be Barons, and to sit in Parliament, as Judges, and in Court of Star-Chamber, High Commission, and other Courts of Justice) and also power spirituall over Ministers and People, to ordain, silence, suspend, deprive, excommunicate, &c. their spiritual power be not as dangerous (though both be dangerous) and as much to be opposed as their temporal? 1 Because the spiritual is over our consciences, the temporal, but over our purses. 2 Because the spiritual have more influence into Gods Ordinances to defile them, then the temporal. 3 Because spiritual judgements and evils are greater then other. 4 Because the Pope was Antichrist, before he did assume any temporal power. 5 Because the Spiritual is more inward and lesse discerned: and therefore it concerns all those that have Spiritual eyes, and desire to worship God in spirit and truth, to consider, and endeavour

endeavour to abrogate their Spiritual usurpations as well as their Temporal.

Whether *Aerius* be justly branded by *Epiphanius* and *Austin* for a Hereticke (as some report) for affirming Bishops, and Presbyters to be of an equal power?

Epiphanius
saith he did,
Arium ipsum
dogma non
erat. Superare.
Austin saith in
Arianorum
haeresin lapsus.
Epiph. accu-
sed him, be-
cause he said
that *supersti-*
tium peccat. did
not *operari*
ei qui ex hoc
vita discesse-
vit. And *Au-*
stin accused
Aerius, because
he said, *Non li-*
cet orare, vel
offerre pro mor-
tuis oblationem.

Wee say, as some report, for the truth is, he is charged with heresie merely and onely because he was an *Arian*. As for his opinion of the parity of a Presbyter with a Bishop; this indeed is called by *Austin*, *proprium dogma Aerii*, the proper opinion of *Aerius*. And by *Epiphanius* it is called *Dogma furiosum & folium*, a mad and foolish opinion, but not an heresie neither by the one nor the other. But let us suppose (as is commonly thought) that he was accounted an Heretick for this opinion: yet notwithstanding, that this was but the private opinion of *Epiphanius*, and borrowed out of him by *Austin*, and an opinion not to be allowed, appeares:

First, because the same Authors condemne *Aerius*, as much for reprehending and censuring the mentioning of the dead in the publique prayers, and the performing of good works for the benefit of the dead. And also for the reprehending *stata ieiunia*, and the keeping of the week before Easter as a solemne Fast; which if worthy of condemnation, would bring in most of the reformed Churches into the censure of Heresie.

Secondly, because not onely Saint *Hierome*, but *Austin* himself, *Sedulius*, *Primasius*, *Chrysostome*, *Theodoret*, *Oecumenius*, *Theophilact*, were of the same opinion with *Aerius* (as *Michael Meaina* observes in the Council of *Trent*, and hath written, *Lib. 1. de sacr. hom. origine.*) and yet none of these deserving the name of Fools, much lesse to be branded for Hereticks.

Thirdly, because the Councell did ever condemne this for Heresie; but on the contrary, *Concilium Aquisgranense*, sub *Ludovico Pio Imp.* 1. anno 816. hath approved it for true Divinity out of the Scripture, That Bishops and Presbyters are equal, bringing the same texts that *Aerius* doth, and which *Epiphanius* indeed undertakes to answer; but how slightly let any indifferent Reader judge.

Whether the great Apostasie of the Church of *Rome* hath not been, in swerving from the Discipline of Christ, as well as from the doctrine? For so it seems by that text, 2. *Thess.* 2. 4. And also, *Revel.* 18. 7. and divers others. And if so, then it much concerns all those that desire the purity of the Church, to consider, how neere the Discipline of the Church of England borders upon Antichrist;

Whitaker. Re-
spons. ad Cam-
pian. vat. 10.
hath these

words: 11
Aerium Epipha-
nus & Augu-
stinus in haeti-
cis numerant,
& prater eos
antiqui pauci.
Et si Presby-
terum Episcopo
kyteris annuo

aequare sit haeticum, nihil Catholicum esse potest. Cum Aerio Hieronymus de Pres-
sensit Illos enim iure divino Episcopis aequales esse statuit.

left, while they endeavour to keep out Antichrist from entering by the door of doctrine, they should suffer him secretly to creep in by the door of Discipline, especially considering, what is here said in this Booke, That by their own confession the Discipline of the Church of England is the same with the Church of Rome.

Whether Episcopacie be not made a place of Dignity, rather than Duty, and desired onely for the great revenues of the place? And whether, if the largeness of their revenues were taken away, Bishops would not decline the great burthen and charge of soules necessarily annexed to their places, as much as the ancient Bishops did, who hid themselves, that they might not be made Bishops and cut off their cares, rather then they would be made Bishops: whereas now Bishops cut off the cares of those that speak against their Bishopricks?

12

How it comes to pass, that in England there is such increase of Popery, Superstition, Arminianism, and prophaneness, more then in other Reformed Churches? Doth not the root of these Disorders proceed from the Bishops and their adherents, being forced to hold correspondencie with Rome, to uphold their greatness, and their Courts and Canons, wherein they symbolize with Rome? And whether it be not to be feared, that they will rather consent to the bringing in of Popery, for the upholding of their dignities, then part with their dignities for the upholding of Religion?

13

Why should England that is one of the chiefest Kingdomes in Europe, that separates from Antichrist, maintain and defend a Discipline different from all other Reformed Churches, which stand in the like Separation? And whether the continuance in this Discipline will not at last bring us to communion with Rome, from which we are separated, and to separation from the other Reformed Churches, unto which we are united?

14

Whether it be fit that the name Bishop, which in Scripture is common to the Presbyters with the Bishops (and not only in Scripture, but also in Antiquity for some hundreds of years) should still be appropriated to Bishops, and ingrossed by them, and not rather to be made common to all Presbyters; and the rather because?

15

First, we finde by woful experience, that the great Equivocation that lieth in the name Bishop, hath been, and is at this day a great prop and pillar to uphold Lordly Prelacy; for this is the great Goliath, the master-piece, and indeed the onely argument with which they think to silence all opposers; to wit, the Antiquity of Episcopacie, that it hath continued in the Church of Christ for 1500 years, &c. which argument is cited by this Remonstrant *ad nauseam*

usque

Sozomen. hist.
lib. 6. cap. 10.

usque & usque. Now it is evident that this argument is a *Paralogism*, depending upon the Equivocation of the name Bishop. For Bishops in the Apostles time were the same with Presbyters in name and office, and so for a good while after. And when afterwards they came to be distinguished, the Bishops of the Primitive times differed as much from ours now, as *Rome* ancient from *Rome* at this day, as hath been sufficiently declared in this Book. And the best way to confute this argument is by bringing in a Community of the name Bishop to a Presbyter as well as to a Bishop.

Secondly, because we finde that the late Innovators which have so much disturbed the peace and purity of our Church, did first begin with the alteration of words; and by changing the word *Table* into the word *Altar*, and the word *Minister* into the word *Priest*, and the word *Sacrament* into the word *Sacrifice*, have endeavoured to bring in the *Papish Mass*. And the Apostlie exhorts us, 2 *Tim.* 1. 13. *To hold fast the form of sound words*: and 1 *Tim.* 6. 20. *To avoid the prophane novelties of words*. Upon which text we will only mention what the Rhemists have commented, which we conceive to be worthy consideration. (*Nam instruunt nos non solum docentes, sed etiam errantes.*) The Church of God hath alwayes been as diligent to resist novelties of words, as her adversaries are busie to invent them, for which cause she will not have us communicate with them, nor follow their fashions and phrase newly invented, though in the nature of the words sometimes there be no harm. Let us keep our forefathers words, and we shall easily keep our old and true faith, that we had of the first Christians; let them say, *Amendment*, *Abstinence*, the *Lords Supper*, the *Communion-Table*, *Elders*, *Ministers*, *Super-intendant*, *Congregation*, *So be it*, *Praise ye the Lord*, *Morning Prayer*, *Evening Prayer*, and the rest as they will; Let us avoid those novelties of words, according to the *Apostles* prescript, and keep the old terms, *Penance*, *Fast*, *Priests*, *Church*, *Bishop*, *Mass*, *Martin*, *Even-Song*, the *B. Sacrament*, *Altar*, *Oblation*, *Host*, *Sacrifice*, *Hallelujah*, *Amen*; *Lent*, *Palm-Sunday*, *Christmass*, and the words will bring us to the faith of our first *Apostles*, and condemn these new *Apostates*, new faith and phrase.

Quest. 16.

Whether having proved that God never set such a Government in his Church as our Episcopal Government is, we may lawfully any longer be subject unto it, be present at their *Courts*, obey their *Injunctions*, and especially be instruments in publishing, and executing their *Excommunications* and *Absoiutions*?

And thus we have given (as we hope) a sufficient answer, and as brief as the matter would permit, to the *Remonstrants*. With whom, though

though we agree not in opinion touching *Episcopacie* and *Liturgie*; yet we fully consent with him, to pray unto Almighty God, *who is great in power, and infinite in wisdom, to poure down upon the whole Honourable Assembly, the spirit of wisdom, and understanding, the spirit of Counsel & might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord: That you may be able to discern betwixt things that differ, separate between the precious and the vile, purely purge away our dross, and take away all our tin, root out every plant that is not of our heavenly Fathers planting: That so you may raise up the foundations of many generations, and be called the Repairers of breaches, and Restorers of paths to dwell in. Even so, Amen.*

A P O S C R I P T.

THough we might have added much light and beauty to our Discourse, by inserting variety of Histories upon several occasions given us in the *Remonstrance*, the answer whereof we have undertaken; especially where it speaks of the bounty and gracious *Munificence* of Religious Princes toward the *Bishops*, yet unwilling to break the thread of our discourse, and its connexion with the *Remonstrance* by so large a digression, as the whole series of Historie producible to our purpose, would extend unto: We have chosen rather to subjoyn by way of *Appendix*, an historical Narration of those bitter fruits, *Pride, Rebellion, Treason, Unthankfulness, &c.* which have issued from *Episcopacy*, while it hath stood under the continued influences of Sovereigne goodness. Which Narration would fill a Volume, but we will bound our selves unto the Stories of this Kingdom, and that revolution of time which hath passed over us since the erection of the *See of Canterbury*. And because in most things the beginning is observed to be a presage of that which follows, let their Founder *Austin* the Monk come first to be considered. Whom we may justly account to have been such to the English, as the Arrian Bishops were of old to the Goths, and the Jesuits now among the Indians, who, of Pagans have made but Arrians and Papists. His ignorance in the Gospel which he preached is seen in his idle & Judaical consultations with the Pope, about things clean and unclean; his proud demeanour toward the British Clergy, appears in his Council called about no solid point of faith, but celebration of Easter, where having troubled and threatened the Churches of Wales, and afterwards of Scotland, about Romish Ceremonies, he is said in fine to have been the stirrer up of *Eibelsbert*, by means of the Northumbrian King, to the slaughter of twelve

*Beda.
Holinsh.
Speed.*

hundred of those poor laborious Monks of *Banger*. His Successors busied in nothing but urging and instituting Ceremonies, and maintaining Precedency we palls over.

Holinb. out Till *Dunstan*, the Sa nted Prelate, who of a frantick Necro-
of Capgrave. maacer, and suspected fornicatour, was shorn a Monk, and after-
Osborn, wards made a Bishop. His worthy deeds are noted by *Speed*, to
Higden. have been the cheating King *Eldred* of the treasure committed to his keeping; the prohibiting of marriage, to the increasing of all filthiness in the Clergy of those times; as the long Oration of King

Edgar in *Stow* well testifies.

Edw Conf. In *Edward* the Confessors dayes, *Robert* the *Norman* no sooner Archbishop of *Canterbury*, but setting the King and Earl *Godwine* at variance for private revenge, broach't a Civil War, till the Archbishop was banisht.

Holb. 191. Now *William* the Conquerour had set up *Lankefrank*, Bishop of
Will. Cong. *Canterbury*, who to requite him, spent his faithful service to the Pope *Gregory*, in perswading the King to subject himself and his State to the Papacy, as himself writes to the Pope, *Snassi, sed non persuassi.*

Will. Ruf. The treason of *Anselm* to *Rufus* was notorious, who not content to withstand the King, obstinately in money-matters, made suit to ferch his Pall or Investiture of Archiepiscopacy from *Rome*, which the King denying as flat against his Regal Sovereignty, he went without his leave, and for his Romish good service received great honour from the Pope, by being seated at his right foot in a Synod, with these words, *Includamus hunc in orbe nostro tanquam alterius orbis Papam.* Whence perhaps it is that the See of *Canterbury* hath affected a Patriarchy in our dayes. This *Anselm* also condemned the married Clergy.

Hen. 1. *Henry* the First reigning, the same *Anselm* deprived those Prelates that had been Invested by the King, and all the Kingdom is vext with one Prelate, who the second time betakes himself to his old fortrels at *Rome*, till the King was fain to yield. Which done, and the Archbishop returned, spends the rest of his dayes in a long contention and unchristian jangling with *York* about Primacie. Which ended not so, but grew hot between *York* and *London*, as Dean to *Canterbury*, striving for the upper seat at Dinner, till the King seeing their odious pride, put them both out of doors.

Holinb. 38. To speak of *Ralph* and *Thurstan*, the next Archbishops, pursuing the same quarrel, were tedious, as it was no small molestation to the King and Kingdom, *Thurstan* refusing to stand to the Kings doom, and wins the day, or else the King must be accurs'd by the Pope;

Pope; which further animates him to try the mastery with *William* next Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and no man can end it but their Father the Pope, for which they travel to *Rome*. In the meanwhile, marriage is sharply decreed against, *Speed* 448. and the Legate *Cremenensis*, the Declamour against Matrimony taken with a Strumpet the same night.

In King *Stephens* Reign, the haughty Bishops of *Canterbury* and *Winchester* bandy about Precedency; and to *Rome* to end the Duel. *Theobald* goes to *Rome* against the Kings will; interdicts the Realm, and the King forc't to suffer it; till refusing to Crown *Eustace*, the Kings Son, because the Pope had so commanded, he flies again.

Becket's pride and out-ragious treasons are too manifest; resigning the Kings gift of his Archbishoprick to receive it of the Pope; requiring the Custody of *Rocheſter*-castle, and the Tower of *London*, as belonging to his *Seignorie*. Protects murdering Priests from Temporal Sword; standing stiffly for the Liberties and Dignities of Clerks, but little to chastise their vices, vvch besides other crying sins, vvete above a hundred murthers since *Henry* the Seconds crowning, till that time: to maintain vvch, most of the Bishops conspire, till the terrour of the King made them shrink; but *Becket* obdures, denies that the King of *Englands* Courts have authority to judge him. And thus was this noble King disquieted by an insolent Traitor; in habit of a Bishop, a great part of his Reigne; the Land in uproar; many Excommunicate, and accursed; *France* and *England* set to War, and the King himself curbed, and controlled; and lastly, disciplin'd by the Bishops and Monks: first, vvith a bare-foot penance, that drevv blood from his feet, and lastly, with fourscore lashes on his anointed body vvith Rods.

In the same Kings time it vvvas that the Archbishop of *York* striving to sit above *Canterbury*, squats him down on his lap, vvhen vvith many a cuff he vvvas throwvn down.

Next the pride of *W. Longchamp*, Bishop of *Elie*, was notorious, vvho vvould ride vvith a thousand horse; and of a Governour in the Kings absence, became a Tyrant; for vvch flying in Womans apparel he vvvas taken.

To this succeeds contention betveen *Canterbury* and *York*, about carriage of their Crosses, and *Rome* appeal'd to: the Bishop of *Durham* buyes an Earldom.

No sooner another King, but *Hubert* another Archbishop to

144.
King John.

Holinsh. 42.
43.

K. Stephens.

Holinsh. 57.
58, 59.

Henry 3.

Speed 462.
out of *Nu-*
brigens.

Yet this manis
life is lately
Printed in Eng
lish, as a thing
to be imitated.

Holinsh. 70.

Speed 469.

Holinsh 98.

Richard 1.

Page 129,

130, 132.

vex him, and lest that were not enough, made Chancellour of England. And besides him, *Jeffery of York*, who refusing to pay a Subsidy within his Precincts, and therefore all his temporalities seaz'd; excommunicates the Sheriff, beats the Kings Officers, and interdicts his whole Province. *Hubert* outbraves the King in Christ-mas house-keeping; hinders King *John* by his Legantine power from recovering *Normandy*. After him *Stephen Langton*, set up by the Pope in spite of the King, who opposing such an affront, falls under an interdict, with his whole Land; and at the suit of his Archbishop to the Pope, is depos'd by Papal Sentence; his Kingdom given to *Philip* the French King, *Langtons* friend; and lastly, resignes and enfeuds his Crown to the Pope.

After this tragical *Stephen*, the fray which *Boniface* the next Archbishop but one had with the Canons of Saint *Bartolmews*, is as pleasant; the tearing of Hoods and Cowles, the miring of Copes, the flying about of Wax Candles, and Censors in the scuffle, cannot be imagined without mirth; as his oaths were loud in this bickering, so his curses were as vehement in the contention with the Bishop of *Winchester* for a slight occasion. But now the Bishops had turned their contesting into base and servile flatteries, to advance themselves on the ruine of the subjects. For *Peter de Rupibus* Bishop of *Winchester* perswading the King to displace English Officers, and substitute Poictivines, and telling the Lords to their faces, that there were no Peeres in England, as in France, but that the King might do what he would, and by whom he would, became a firebrand to the civill wars that followed.

In this time *Peckam* Archbishop of *Can.* in a Synod was tampering vvith the Kings liberties, but being threatened desisted. But his successor *Winchelsey* on occasion of Subsidies demanded of the Clergie, made answer, That having two Lords, one Spirituall, the other Temporall, he ought rather to obey the Spirituall governour the Pope, but that he vvould send to the Pope to know his pleasure, and so persisted even to beggerie. The Bishop of *Durham* also cited by the King flies to Rome.

In the deposing of this King vvho more forvvard, then the Bishop of *Hereford*? vvitnesse his Sermon at *Oxford*, My head, my head aketh, concluding that an aking and sick head of a King vv as to be taken off vvithout further Physick.

John the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, suspected to hinder the Kings glorious victories in *Flanders*, and *France*, by stopping the conveyance of monies committed to his charge, conspiring therein vvith vvish the Pope. But not long after vv as constituted that fatall

pramunire, vvhich vvas the first nipping of their courage, to seek aide *Holb. 409*
at *Rome*. And next to that, the wide wounds that *Wickleffe* made
in their sides. From which time they have been falling, and thence
forth all the smোক that they could vomit, was turned against the
rising light of pure doctrine.

Yet could not their Pride misse occasion to set other mischief on *Richard 2.*
foot. For the Citizens of *London* rising to apprehend a riotous ser-
vant of the Bishop of *Salisbury* then Lord Treasurer, who with his
fellowes stood on his guard in the Bishops house, were by the Bi-
shop who maintained the riot of his servant, so complained of, that *Holb. 478.*
the King therewith seized on their liberties, and set a Governour
over the Citie. And who knowes not, that *Thomas Arundell* Arch-
bishop of *Canterbury* was a chief instrument and agent in deposing
King *Richard*, as his actions and Sermon well declares. *Page 506.*

The like intended the Abbot of *Westminster* to *Henry 4.*
Henry the fourth, who for no other reason, but because he suspected that the King
did not favour the wealth of the Church, drew into a most horrible
conspiracie the Earles of *Kent*, *Rutland*, and *Salisbury*, to kill the
King in a turnament at *Oxford*, who yet notwithstanding was a
man that professed to leave the Church in better state then he
found it. For all this, soone after is *Richard Scroop* Archbishop of *Speed 631.*
York in the field against him, the chiefe attractor of the rebellious
party. *Holb. 529.*

In these times *Thomas Arundell* a great persecutor of the Gospel *Henry 5.*
preached, by *Wicklefs* followers, dies a fearfull death, his tongue so
swelling vvhithin his mouth, that he must of necessity starve. His suc-
cessor *Chicheley* nothing milder diverts the King, that vvas looking
too neerly into the superfluous revenues of the Church, to a bloody
warre. *Speed 638.*

All the famous conquests vvhich *Henry* the fifth had made in *Henry 6.*
France, vvere lost by a civil dissension in *England*, vvhich sprung
first from the haughty pride of *Beaufort* Bishop and Cardinall of
Winchester, and the Archbishop of *York* against the Protector, *Speed Holb. 596.*
674. In the civill warres the Archbishop sides with the Earle of *Page 620.*
Warwick, and *Marchin Kent*, *Speed 682.*

Edward the Fourth, *Mowntacute* Archbishop of *York*, one of the *Edward 4.*
chiefe conspirators with *Warwick* against *Edward* the fourth, and af-
terwards his Jaylor, being by *Warwicks* treason committed to this
Bishop. *Speed 699.*

In *Edward* the Fifts time, the Archbishop of *York* was, though *Edward 5.*
perhaps unwittingly (yet by a certain fate of Prelacie) the unhap-
py instrument of pulling the young Duke of *York* out of Sanctu-
ary, into his cruel Uncles hands.
Things

Richard 3.

Things being settled in such a peace, as after the bloody brawls was to the afflicted Realm howsoever acceptable, though not such as might be wished: *Morton* Bishop of *Ely*, enticing the Duke of *Buckingham* to take the Crown, which ruin'd him, opened the veins of the poor subjects to bleed afresh.

Henry 8.

Hol. 845.

462.

The intolerable pride, extortion, bribery, luxury of *Walsley* Archbishop of *York*, who can be ignorant of? selling Dispensations by his power Legantine for all offences, insulting over the Dukes and Peers, of whom some he brought to destruction by bloody policie, playing with State-affairs according to his humour, or benefit: causing *Tournay*, got with the blood of many a good Souldier, to be rendred at the French Kings secret request to him, not without bribes; with whom one while siding, another while with the Emperour, he sold the honour and peace of *England*, at what rates he pleased; and other crimes to be seen in the Articles against him, *Holinshed*. 912. and against all the Bishops in general, 911, which when the Parliament sought to remedie, being most excessive extortion in the Ecclesiastical Courts, the Bishops cry out; Sacriledge, the Church goes to ruine, as it did in *Bohemia*, with the Schisme of the *Hussites*, *Ibid*. After this, though the Bishops ceased to be Papists; for they preached against the Popes Supremacie, to please the King, yet they ceased not to oppugne the Gospel, causing *Tindals* Translation to be burnt, yea, they agreed to the suppressing of Monasteries, leaving their revenues to the King, to make vway for the six bloody Articles, which proceedings with all cruelty of inquisition are set down, *Holinsh.* pag. 946. till they were repealed the second of *Edward* the Sixth, stopping in the mean while the cause of Reformation well begun by the Lord *Cromwel*.

Speed 784.

Hol. 992,

And this mischief was wrought by *Steven Gardiner*, Bishop of *Winchester*. The six Articles are set down in *Speed*, pag. 792.

Speed 792.

Speed.

Statnt. Hen.

8. Anno 35.

cap. 5.

Edward 6.

The Archbishop of Saint *Andrews*, his hindring of *England*, and *Scotlands* Union, for fear of Reformation, *Speed* 794.

As for the dayes of King *Edward* the Sixth, we cannot but acknowledge to the glory of the rich mercy of God, that there was a great Reformation of Religion made even to admiration. And yet notwithstanding we do much dislike the humour of those, that cry up those dayes as a compleat pattern of Reformation, and that endeavour to reduce our Religion to the first times of King *Edward*, which we conceive were comparatively very imperfect, there being foure impediments which did much hinder that blessed work.

The three Rebellions. One in *Henry* the Eighths time, by the Priests of *Lincoln* and *Yorkshire*, for that Reformation which

Crom.

Cromwel had made. [The other two in King *Edward's* dayes. One in *Cornwal*, the other in *Yorkeshire*.

The strife that arose suddenly amongst the Peers, emulating one anothers honour, *Speed*, pag. 837.

The violent opposition of the Popish Bishops, which made *Martin Bucer* write to King *Edward* in his Book *de Regno Christi*, lib. 2 cap. 1. and say, Your Majesty doth see, that this restoring again the Kingdom of Christ, which we require, yea, which the salvation of us all requireth, may in no wise be expected to come from the Bishops, seeing there be so few among them which do understand the power and proper Offices of this Kingdom; and very many of them by all means (which possibly they can and dare) either oppose themselves against it, or defer and hinder.

The deficiency of zeal and courage even in those Bishops who afterwards proved Martyrs, witness the sharp contention of *Ridley* against *Hooper* for the ceremonies. And the importunate suit of *Cranmer* and *Ridley* for toleration of the Mass for the Kings sister, which was rejected by the Kings not only reasons, but tears; where-by the young King shewed more zeal then his best Bishops, 839.

The inhumane butcheries, blood-sheddings, and cruelties of *Gardiner*, *Bonner*, and the rest of the Bishops in Queen *Maries* dayes, are so fresh in every mans memory, as that we conceive it a thing altogether unnecessary to make mention of them: Onely we fear lest the guilt of the blood then shed, should yet remain to be required at the hands of this Nation, because it hath not publickly endeavoured to appease the wrath of God by a general and solemn humiliation for it.

What the practises of the Prelates have been ever since, from the beginning of Queene *Elizabeth* to this present day, would fill a volume (like *Ezekiels* Roll) with lamentation, mourning, and wo to record. For it hath been their great designe to hinder all further Reformation; to bring in doctrines of Popery, Arminianisme, and Libertinisme, to maintain, propagate and much encrease the burden of humane ceremonies: to keep out, and beat down the Preaching of the Word, to silence the faithfull Preachers of it, to oppose and persecute the most zealous professours, and to turn all Relig. on into a pompous out-side; and to tread down the power of godliness. Inasmuch as it is come to an ordinary Proverb, that when any thing is spoiled, we use to say, *The Bishop's foot hath been in it*. And in this (and much more which might be said) fulfilling *Bishop Den-*

and Prophecie, who when he saw that in King Edwards reformation, there was a reservation of Ceremonies and Hierarchy, is credibly reported to have used these words: *Since they have begun to taste of our Bread, it will not be long ere they will eat of our Beef.*

FINIS.

3